The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1890.

The Week.

THE general summary of results of the local elections in New York State during the past few weeks, which is made by the Albany *Argus*, is very striking. Town officers have been elected in about two-thirds of the counties of the State, and the totals of the changes in the boards of supervisors show conclusively that the Democrats have made uniform gains. They have 424 members now against 341 last year, while the Republicans have 441 now against 522 last year. The *Argus* attributes the Democratic gains to two causes, dissatisfaction with the Administration of President Harrison, and the growth of Democratic belief in agricultural New York. The Republican press was at first inclined to regard the assertion of a spread of tariff-reform sentiment among the farmers as rather amusing, but we observe that it is not treating it in that way any longer. The news from the Northwest, harmonizing perfectly with this from rural New York, is visibly depressing.

There is a wide difference between the two ballot-reform bills whose passage is now assured by the Legislatures of New York and Maryland. The New York bill is a genuine reform measure, which has been revised and amended solely with a view to making it as effective as possible in practice. It is in every way superior to the two preceding bills which the Governor has vetoed, that is, so far as minor details are concerned. Its vital principles, which are those of the Australian system as embodied in the Massachusetts and eight other American State laws, are the same as those of the two preceding bills. That the Governor will veto this as he did the others is now generally anticipated, but he will have to do so in the face of more widespread opposition than ever, and it may be that a sufficient number of Democrats in the Legislature will bow to the popular demand to secure the passage of the bill over a veto. The Maryland bill has been amended into such shape as to destroy a great deal of its usefulness, the Gorman influence having been exerted to that end through the instinct of self-preservation. Just how good or how bad a bill it is, cannot be ascertained from the meagre reports which are published concerning it, but there is little doubt that it is a sham measure in many respects. The opponents of genuine ballot reform in Rhode Island have been hoping that the new law, which goes into effect there at the election next month, would prove unsatisfactory, but they must prepare for as bitter a disappointment as they suffered in Massachusetts, for the new law had a preliminary trial in an election on Block Island last week, and worked with complete success. Block Island has been for some years the rottenest borough of the State, and if the system will work well there, its success elsewhere is certain.

The platform which the Rhode Island Republicans adopted at their Convention on Thursday contains the following owlish deliverance on the tariff: "A reform of the tariff, based not merely upon theory, but upon the actual needs and conditions of our whole industrial community, and having in view the strengthening of the American principle of protection to home labor, has been successfully inaugurated." No key is furnished to this mysterious deliverance, but we should think that the Republican manufacturers of Rhode Island who have signed so generally the petition for free raw materials which has been sent to Congress from New England, would ask for specifications of the "reform which has been inaugurated." The Providence *Journal's* terse comment on the platform is, that it "was machine-made but hand-painted," which seems to exclude the human mind from any share in its construction. The McKinley bill is the only tariff reform which has been inaugurated thus far, and if that is "based upon the actual needs and conditions" of an industrial community which is on the verge of financial collapse only to be averted by free raw materials, nobody has been able to discover the fact.

One of the very bad effects of a protective tariff is the stimulus given to lying among the beneficiaries of it. Let it be known that there is a revision going on--and there always will be revisions as long as we have a tariff—then straightway all sorts of people, who were doing very well before, and indeed bragging of their prosperity, rush to Congress and declare under oath that unless they get an increase of duty on their products, they will be ruined and all their neighbors will be ruined too. This is the case with the fruit-growers of Florida and California at the present time. We know for a certainty that the production of oranges, prunes, raisins, olives, etc., has been steadily increasing in this country under the existing tariff. We read from time to time in the agricultural and horticultural journals glowing accounts and statistical reports showing the large profits made in the business—so much larger than any profits made in the growing of wheat, corn, or cotton that the contrast is almost painful. Yet no sooner is a new tariff bill announced than these highly favored people come to Washington swearing that they shall have to go out of the business altogether unless they get more protection. It happens in the case of these orange, prune, and raisin-growers that their products, owing to advantages of soil, climate, nearness, skill, or other reasons, are actually better than the corresponding imported articles, and command a higher price in the market. Does that fact abate their demands? Not a jot. Does it bring any redness to their cheeks when they tell about their impoverishment and impending ruin? Not a blush.

The introduction of a bill in the House proposing a duty on coffee equal to the export duty laid upon it in any foreign country, will be to the South Americans a good instance of the perfect deference with which we propose to treat their countries, in this era of pan-American good-feeling, and of our entire unwillingness to interfere in the slightest degree with their systems of taxation. Brazil's export tax on coffee, for example, is purely a matter of internal administration, with which we have nothing to do. Brazil has no land-tax: under the present conditions of land-holding it seems impossible to lay one. She has no income tax: to collect one would cost more than it would come to. She has no internal-revenue system. And so, to meet the expenses of the Government, in addition to the customs duties on imports, she lays a small, easily collected, more or less equably diffused and steadily diminishing tax on her great article of export. For us to object to that, and to propose to interfere with her manner of raising an income, is not only ungracious, but exceedingly impolitic at this time, when Brazil's relations to the United States promise to become much closer than they ever have been. What is true of her case is true, in a degree, of the other countries against which the bill is aimed.

The Pan-American Conference has at last reached the subject of its *raison d'être*, viz., steamship subsidies. The Committee having this subject in charge have agreed to report recommending to the several Governments

"that aid be given one or more lines of steam navigation between the ports of the United States and those of Brazil and Rio de la Plata, the companies receiving Government aid to establish a fast bi-monthly service between the ports of the United States, Rio Janeiro, Montevideo, and Buenos Ayres, and the vessels to have the accommodations and capacity necessary for the transportation of freight and passengers and to carry the mails. These steamships shall only touch at one port of the intermediary countries on the trips to and from Buenos Ayres. The Committee also recommends aiding an auxiliary line of freight steamships, which shall sail twice a month, making not less than twelve knots an hour, and touching at ports of the United States and Brazil. The United States of America and the republic of Brazil shall pay one-half each of the amounts paid to these vessels, taking into due consideration the contract of the existing line with the latter Government. The contracts shall last ten years. The States shall have the right to impose their flag and register upon the vessels to a number proportionate to the percentage of the aid they pay. In that case it is understood that the quota of each nation shall be paid directly to the vessel or vessels carrying its flag. The contracting States shall accept only vessels constructed in the United States in consideration of the higher aid by that Government. Bolivia and Paraguay agree to the plan on condition that the companies agree to establish subsidiary lines of river navigation."

How this plan will work in with the bill of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American Shipping League, which proposes to pay a bounty of thirty cents per ton per thousand miles sailed to everybody in the shipping business, we do not see. We suppose, however, that South American trade is to be made a special case, and that the ships that take subsidy under the Pan-American plan are not to be allowed bounty under the thirty-cent plan. Whether either plan can pass Congress, in view of the rapid encroachments on the Treasury surplus and the still unsatisfied demands of other beggars and grabbers, is extremely doubtful. Inasmuch as two Democratic members of the Committee on Merchant Marine are said to be in favor of subsidies, the Republican side of the House are not necessarily committed to the plan as a party measure. And it seems to us that unless carried as a party measure under a vigorous use of the lash, the chances of its passage are very dubious.

In an interview with Senator Allison, recently published, the Iowa statesman, being asked whether he was in favor of "helping the shipping interest," replied:

> "In a reasonable way I am. There was a curious thing about shipping came to my knowledge a few days ago. Corn is worth from 10 to 12 cents a bushel less in Iowa than it was last year. The rates of inland freight are substantially the same now as then—they have not been increased, certainly. Yet the difference between the price of corn now and last year in Liverpool is only 4 cents. In other words, the ocean freights upon all agricultural products have immensely advanced within the last year. Our people should take hold in some way of this question of ocean freights, as it seems to me they have advanced without any just cause, especially as respects all farm products. This is illustrated, as I have already shown, by the difference in the price of corn in Iowa and in Liverpool, without any corresponding difference in the price of railroad transportation, which shows that the people of the United States are interested in improving our shipping facilities. Just how it will be done I am not prepared to say, but that it ought to be done I am sure."

This problem ought not to be a difficult one to a Senator representing a corn-growing State. The question being how to get the bounty into the pocket of the farmer, the Illinois State Board of Agriculture replied the other day by a resolution asking that it be paid to the farmer directly, and not by the roundabout process of paying it to a ship-owner, and trusting to luck that it will eventually get around to the farmer. Mr. Allison cannot ponder that resolution too seriously. What is good for the Illinois corn-grower, must be good for the Iowa corn-grower. The two States are alike in all the particulars of corn-growing, except that Iowa is a little further from market, and therefore ought, perhaps, to have one cent per bushel more in the way of bounty than Illinois. Of course, if a liberal bounty were paid for growing corn, the farmer could pay better wages to the ship-owner for carrying it.

Mr. John M. Forbes of Boston told Mr. Farquhar's Committee the other day exactly how to get American ships into business. He said that he bought steel ships on the Clyde and put them under the British flag or the Hawaiian flag (since our laws do not permit him to put them under the American flag), and hired American captains to navigate them. If he were allowed to put them under the American flag, he would buy a lot more ships. He scorned bounties in any case, but he thought that the Government owed protection to his property afloat on the high seas. The sagacious Farquhar thought that this indicated gross selfishness, "wanting to use the American flag for his own personal benefit." The public-spirited plan would be to come straight up to the Treasury and take your bounty.

The Boston *Journal* very carelessly calls attention to the large immigration which is constantly poured into New England from the British provinces to compete with the home laborers. Speaking of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton, as ranking with Ireland and the province of Quebec "among the great sources of supply from which New England recruits the foreign contingent in its vast army of workers," it shows that from points east of Vanceboro' there came over the Maine border by rail alone in 1889 38,989 passengers, the vast majority of whom, it says, were "seeking employment in Uncle Sam's domain." If all of New England's industries were booming, wages were going up, and workers scarce, the working classes in New England already would have no fault to find with this situation. But under existing circumstances it is not surprising that the "tariff scare" would not work in the New England manufacturing centres in the last Presidential campaign. Mills are closing, industries moving to new fields, manufacturers themselves declaring that the burdens of the tariff must be lightened lest they perish; and all the time there is free trade in labor, and the surplus population of the provinces is pouring in to share with the native workers what wage fund there is to be divided. Of course the laborers ask, Why should we not be allowed to work with the coal and the ores of Canada if the laborers of Canada can come in free to compete with us?

We are glad to be informed by Mr. John T. Morse, jr., that he was not in the least responsible for the views upon the teaching of political economy at Harvard which were contained in the report of the Committee of which he was Chairman. It appears that the report was not intended for publication, that it was "carefully stated not to be an expression of my [Mr. Morse's] personal views," and that Mr. Morse was not a member of that portion of the Committee to whom the inspection of the Department of Political Economy (as distinguished from history) was intrusted. None of these points could have been inferred from what was published as the report of the Committee on Political Economy in the *American Economist* of February 7, whence we derived our knowledge of the report. As our article was, of course, not at all a personal criticism of Mr. Morse, we need only say that it is pleasant to find that the unenlightened views which we criticised cannot claim him as their sponsor; and we should have been pleased if he could have gone further than make a mere non-committal disclaimer in regard at least to one remark in the Committee's report, upon which we refrained from commenting before. Did it not seem somewhat humiliating to a gentleman and scholar like Mr. Morse to sign—with a merely general disclaimer of personal responsibility—a report which expressed surprise that Harvard's teaching should be absolutely uninfluenced by the consideration that she owes so much of her wealth to "a community of protectionists," and to "gifts of money earned in protected industries"? We feel sure that Mr. Morse must agree with Mr. Putnam, who made a minority report, in regarding this allusion as "an extraordinary and unworthy one."

While the decision of the Circuit Court at St. Louis in regard to the Anti-Trust Law of Missouri is destructive of that law so far as the authority of that Court is concerned, the decision shows that the law was badly drawn, but does not touch the legality of Trusts as such. The demurrer is sustained, in other words, as regards a particular authority conferred by the law on the Secretary of State, not on the point that a Trust is an unlawful conspiracy. This Missouri law authorized the Secretary of State to revoke, of his own will, the charter of any business corporation in the State which refused to send him an affidavit stating whether or not it had done any act prohibited by the statute. The State Constitution provides that no person charged with the exercise of legislative, executive, or judicial power shall exercise any power not belonging to his department. As the forfeiture of a corporation's charter is a judicial act, the Court holds that the authority conferred on the Secretary of State, an executive officer, by the Anti-Trust Law is contrary to the Constitution. The drag-net which this law put into the hands of a single State officer was so open to abuse that, aside from the question of its constitutionality, it seemed designed to bring the law into disrepute; and it is currently reported that the law was framed in this shape because it was deemed easier to overthrow an unconstitutional law in the courts than to defeat anti-Trust legislation at the capital.

That Bismarck's resignation was sure to come before long, most people have believed for some time. Bismarck is not a man to divide responsibility with anybody. He got on well with the old Emperor because he was always sure of having his way in the end, but it was considered certain that he would have to go when the Emperor Frederick ascended the throne. The matter can hardly be considered of great importance in any case. Bismarck's retirement from the active control of affairs could not be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far off in the ordinary course of nature, and only leaves the young Emperor in undisputed possession of the field a few years earlier than he would otherwise have had it. The German people have now a fair prospect of what are called "lively times." With a majority hostile to the Government in the Reichstag; with Socialism growing every day, and undoubtedly by this time making itself felt in the army, and with an inexperienced young man in command of the army, who considers the whole community "a talent" committed to his keeping by Almighty God, we may fairly look forward to that state of things in Germany described in the old English saying as "wigs on the green."

The Turkish question on which the French Ministry has been beaten and resigned, consists in M. Tirard's failure to negotiate a new treaty of commerce with Turkey, to take the place of that of 1861, which is now expiring. A new treaty was negotiated in 1887, and signed on both sides, but was never submitted to the Chambers, in the belief that it would be defeated, as the new treaty with Greece had been. On the 27th of February M. Tirard made an explanation of the position of the Government in the matter, declaring that they did not mean to try to negotiate a new treaty at present, and were going to rely, as far as the treatment of French goods in the Ottoman custom-houses was concerned, on the most-favored-nation clause in the treaty of 1802. To make assurance doubly sure, they got this clause confirmed by an exchange of notes with the Porte, in January of this year. As matters then stood, France was, in his opinion, on exactly the footing which Germany and England have just secured by treaties recently negotiated and now ready to be signed, and he therefore proposed to wait until 1892 before opening any fresh negotiations for a new treaty in behalf of France. What seems to make this situation unpalatable, and has probably led to the overthrow of the Ministry, is the discontent of the French wine-growers over the heavy importation of raisins from Turkey, which now goes on for the manufacture of a cheap wine that competes formidably with the French grape juice, and the doubts of a considerable portion of the Chamber whether the most-favored-nation clause of 1802, even when fortified by a note, really gives French trade in the Levant all the *ad-interim* security it needs.

M. Freycinet is back in power in France with as good a cabinet as the times will permit. M. Constans, whose resignation (for reasons suggested by our Paris correspondent on another page) shook the Tirard Ministry to its centre, is back in his old post. M. Ribot, a first-rate man in every way, is Minister of Foreign Affairs. He is one of the few Frenchmen who speak English perfectly, has an American wife, and has made frequent visits to this country. He is or has been a professor in the School of Political Sciences in Paris. M. Freycinet, the chief, is an able man, but has fully half-a-dozen sources of weakness (or, rather, unpopularity) about him, beginning during the war of 1870 and running down to our own day. It would be unsafe, therefore, to predict a very long life for his Cabinet. The "group" spirit evidently still reigns among the French Deputies.

Lord Randolph Churchill's experience as a politician during the last four years has had a great deal of variety in it. He became prominent by the vigor of his invective and his hostility to the old fogies, as he considered them, of his own party. He was, when Lord Salisbury came last into power, considered formidable enough and able enough to receive the Chancellorship of the Exchequer; but he had not held it many months when he began to attack his own party again, and threw it up in disgust. Since he left office, he has, on the whole, stood by the Tories, but his friendliness towards the Home-Rulers has been, at the same time, very ostentatiously displayed, and he occasionally said a good word for them. Almost every one of his speeches, however, furnished ammunition to both sides, and he gradually destroyed all chance of returning to office under Lord Salisbury. But his last outbreak has apparently taken everybody by surprise, and has been thoroughly characteristic, for, instead of supporting Gladstone's amendment, which would have furnished him with the proper occasion, he reserved himself for a little amendment of Mr. Jennings's, but in supporting it so frightened Mr. Jennings by his anti-ministerial violence that Mr. Jennings himself did not vote. The speech has apparently destroyed all hope of an official career for the orator. Neither party would now trust him round the corner; but some of his last strokes must have told on the Government. The funeral discourses delivered over his political remains by the Conservative press are very amusing reading, and make the earlier attention paid to his utterances difficult to understand. He was one of the small batch of young aristocrats who brought themselves into notice between 1880 and 1886 by their savage attacks on the Grand Old Man, but Balfour is the only one of them who has come to anything.

The death of Baron Dowse, the Irish judge, reported by cable on Friday, must be a relief to Mr. Balfour. Dowse had an extraordinarily sharp tongue and a rich vein of cynical humor, and he used them both in appeal causes mercilessly on the stipendiary magistrates who are charged with the duty of executing the Coercion Acts. The annoyance this gave to the Irish Secretary was very great, and it could not be mitigated by the reflection that Dowse was a poor lawyer, for he was by general confession one of the ablest on the Irish bench. His overhauling of the decisions of the "Removables," as the Home-Rulers call them, was often very entertaining. His observation to one of his brethren who was directing one of the magistrates to "state a case" for the court above on an appeal—"State a case! You might as well ask him to write a Greek ode"—amused the public mightily and had a great run. His satire was all the more poignant because the stipendiary magistrates are one of the great blots on the present government of Ireland. They are to a very large extent either half-pay officers of the army or needy men who have failed in life, and for whom their relatives have to provide in some way. They rarely have any knowledge of law, or much other knowledge, belong to the landlord class, are bitter Tory partisans in politics, and have not a particle of sympathy of any sort with the people over whom they rule under the present régime. In fact, it is hardly too strong to say that as a body they are a disgrace to the British Government.

That the immense coal-miners' strike in England is the direct result of the support given by the London public, and especially by the clerical and philanthropic part of it, to the dock-laborers' strike, there can be little question. Londoners are now thoroughly cured of their philanthropic rage excited by the last-mentioned strike, but they have raised Frankenstein and they cannot lay him. The gasmen's strike, which followed soon after, showed the consequence of exciting unreasonable expectations among ignorant men. On Tuesday there were 30,000 turbulent strikers parading the streets of Liverpool, and putting the whole town in terror, and keeping even the military garrison on the alert, in the firm belief, which people who ought to know better are spreading every day, that there is a great fund somewhere available for the diffusion of comfort and leisure through the community, which the well-to-do are keeping from the poor, and that the notion that temperance and industry and economy are necessary to prosperity—or, in other words, that success in life depends in any large degree on character—is all humbug. The German Emperor's Labor Conference is likely to have the same effect. In fact, it would not be at all surprising if, within the next few years, we were to witness, owing to the follies of philanthropy, the greatest disturbance of industry the modern world has seen, followed, of course, by the usual subsequent increase of misery. The labor problem will pursue every civilized country like a scourge of Providence until people recognize its simplicity. It consists simply in the collection at certain points of more mouths than there is provision for, and the highest law of all says that wherever this is the case there must be suffering. No solution which does not make population lag behind production will ever be of any value. The story which comes from every strike, that thousands stand ready to take the places of the strikers, if they can be protected, contains the secret of the labor problem.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PIG-IRON AND WOOL.

THE advocates of a high tariff, or of protective rates of duty, so called, upon pig-iron and wool, appear to have been somewhat dismayed by the positive proofs which have lately been given by Mr. David A. Wells, that in ten years the difference in price of iron and steel in this country, as compared with the prices which have been paid by the consumers of those metals who have been supplied from British mines and works, amounts to not less than $560,000,000, and has doubtless been a good deal more.

In the attempt to meet this statement, the only reply which the advocates of heavy taxes on imported metal can make seems to be, that, through the application of their policy, the actual prices of iron and steel have been lower than they would have been had not the policy of protection tended to stimulate the construction of iron and steel works in this country. They ask, "What would have been the actual price of pig-iron if the pig-iron industry had not been rapidly developed in the United States by the duties imposed upon foreign metal?" and they impute the reduction, both in this country and in Europe, to the stimulus which has been given in this country by this policy.

This question of what the price *would have been* is a mere subterfuge. No one can prove or disprove their allegations. But every man of common sense is aware that the process of making pig-iron has been subjected to a complete revolution within the last few years, the effect of which has been a great reduction in the cost throughout the world. In the period which Mr. Wells treats, 1878-1887, the reduction in the price of pig-iron was greater in Great Britain than it was in the United States; and it is well proved that the art has not ceased to be profitable, because the product has been well sustained in Great Britain, while it has been rapidly increased in this country. Yet in both countries old furnaces which were misplaced have been put out of blast, and new modern furnaces of greater capacity to produce iron at constantly lessening cost have been constructed.

The admission, however, on the part of the advocates of high tariff, that through their policy the price of iron in Great Britain has been reduced and kept at a much lower point than it would otherwise have been, is the most complete surrender that could be made. In this admission they give up every point on which their policy could be justified. This will become very plain when the relative importance of the production of pig-iron and the consumption thereof are brought into view.

Again, the advocates of a high tariff on wool may be challenged to justify that tax on the same grounds by which they attempt to justify the tax on foreign iron. Do they dare say to the farmers, "Our object in putting a duty upon foreign wool in 1867 was to *reduce* the price of the domestic wool of the United States; our purpose was to exclude the wool of South America and Australia from this country, to throw it all on the markets of Europe, and to put down the price of wool in Europe as well as in this country"?

The moment they presented such an argument as this to the wool-growers of the United States, they know that the wool-growers would instantly turn upon them and scout their policy with contempt; and yet that is exactly what they did. That has been the exact effect of the duties on wool. And this malignant influence of the duty on wool has now gone so far, and has reduced the price of South American wool to so low a point, that the great plains of the Argentine Republic, which had been devoted to pasturage and to the product of wool, are now being ploughed up and planted in wheat. Hence the malignant effect, depressing the price of wool in Europe by excluding South American wool from this great market, will presently be to establish a competition in the production of wheat which, in a very few years, will grow to great proportions, and will be more dangerous to the interests of the wheat-growers of the United States than an East India competition ever has been or ever can be.

Let the advocates of duties on these crude materials tell the farmers, if they dare, that the object of their policy is and has been to depress or put down the price of wool in this country and in Europe; yet that is their only justification of the duty on pig-iron.

What, then, is the relative importance of the production of pig-iron, and what advantage has it been to reduce the price—even if that has been the result of the protective system—as compared to the disadvantage of maintaining the price of pig-iron in this country from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000 a year above that at which the consumers of other countries have been supplied?

This policy originated in Pennsylvania. The impression has been made that the people in Pennsylvania would become paupers were it not for the artificial stimulus and support which have been given to the production of pig-iron by taxing the consumers; and yet even in Pennsylvania the product is utterly insignificant in ratio to the aggregate product of the State. In 1880, when Pennsylvania produced half the pig-iron of the United States, the whole number of men and boys occupied in the production did not exceed 40,000, and their earnings were low—far below the average earnings of those engaged in the higher branches of the iron and steel industry. At the present time the population of Pennsylvania approximates 6,000,000 of people. The product of pig-iron approximates 4,000,000 tons, worth at the mines only $65,000,000 to $75,000,000; possibly giving employment, under rather bad conditions, to 60,000 or 70,000 men and boys. On the other hand, the tax on pig-iron in this country protects the ship-builders, the machinists, the engine-builders, the rail-makers, and the hardware-manufacturers *of Great Britain, France, and Germany*, and tends to give employment in those countries to a force far larger than the petty little force which is occupied in the production of pig-iron in this country.

The advocates of this system cannot deny that invention and science applied to the production of crude iron would have reduced the price in some measure, even had there been no tariff or duty upon it in this country. What would probably have happened under such conditions would have been such a rapid development of the product of iron in Great Britain as to have led, many years ago, to the exhaustion of the fine ores and the coking coals which is now creating such alarm on that side of the water. No one can deny that in such event the iron mines and iron works of this country would have been opened and would have been rapidly developed. The only thing that has been accomplished by the policy of the United States, even if it has accomplished all that is claimed for it by its advocates, has been to delay by ten or fifteen years the time when the paramount control of the production of pig-iron would have passed from Great Britain to this country, as it is now passing under present conditions.

Let it be admitted that, during the ten years under consideration, the actual price of iron here and abroad has been a little lower than it would otherwise have been, and that our consumers, in their vain attempt to retain the home market for the products in which pig-iron is the chief component material (in which they have not succeeded fully), have paid a little less for their iron. But what does it come to, compared with the disadvantage of having been required to pay a great deal more than their competitors each and every year?

If the abatement of the duty should result in giving us more iron at less cost, or even in giving us more iron at a little higher cost, but at the same price as the price at which our foreign competitors are supplied, the stimulus to the machine shop, to the ship-yard, to the engine-builder, and to the higher arts would be so great that the little change in the occupation of the people who are now forced by our tariff to work in the mine or the iron furnace, would be forgotten almost as quickly as it became apparent; the rise in the wages and in the conditions of those who are now occupied in these undesirable branches of work would be so great.

We therefore welcome the admissions with which have been met the unquestioned figures by which it has been proved that the price of protection to the domestic pig-iron furnace in ten years—1878-1887—amounts to far more than the entire value of all the iron mines and iron works of the United States put together. When this fact is generally understood, the duty on pig-iron will go; and that day is not far off.

PRESIDENT ANDREWS ON TRUSTS.

PRESIDENT ANDREWS of Brown University read a paper on Trusts before the Social Science Association at its last annual meeting, which has just been published in the journal of its transactions. The title of the paper is the "Economic Law of Monopoly." It is original in its line of thought and extremely well expressed, being much superior to the paper on the same subject by Prof.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foxwell before the British Association last year.

It is Mr. Andrews's belief that the law of competition, which has been relied on to deliver mankind from every kind of monopoly not created and enforced by the State, can no longer be considered efficient in all cases. State monopolies are no longer tolerated in civilized countries, or, if tolerated, the proceeds go into the common treasury, and the monopoly becomes a special form of taxation, against which no objection lies. *Laissez-faire* monopolies are the dangerous ones, and these are multiplying on every hand, mostly in the form of Trusts; but the object sought by a Trust may in some cases be accomplished by a different organization or even by a common understanding.

An effective organization of a majority in interest in any trade, like sugar-refining for example, may, as Mr. Andrews shows, and as has been shown before, contain all the bad features of monopoly, even when a considerable minority remains outside the Trust. In such a case the minority participates but does not compete. Real competition begins only when the minority is able to make, and does actually make, a serious inroad into the market controlled by the monopoly. Those outside of the combination are as much interested in keeping up prices as those inside. They will do nothing to break the market knowingly. If the combination will let them alone, they will let the combination alone. As was said of the small mills outside of the Canadian Oatmeal Millers' Association, they will "avail themselves of whatever advantage the combination gives them to keep up prices."

But if prices, and consequently profits, are unreasonably high, will not new capital be attracted to the business and thus prices be forced down to the proper level? It is one of the maxims of political economy that this result will follow. This tendency Mr. Andrews admits, but he points to certain facts counteracting the tendency. In the first place, all the parties to the gains of the monopoly, both those inside and those outside of the combination, are interested in keeping their rate of profits secret. They can keep it secret even from their own certificate-holders. They are not amenable to law in the sense that joint-stock corporations are. They are not liable to investigation. They can arrange their book-keeping to suit themselves. New capital is not "attracted" in the way that one body is attracted by another in physics. It requires knowledge, and generally of a very detailed kind, before it feels the attraction.

Again, the amount of capital required to compete with an established Trust must be at least as great as that of the Trust itself. Any less sum is exposed to destruction. Sometimes people will put their money into a venture whose avowed purpose is war with another concern (like the West Shore Railroad against the New York Central); but generally the expectation is to sell the new plant at a profit to the old concern. Such experiments on a large scale are not likely to be repeated; but, supposing them to be repeated again and again, how is the public benefited thereby? Are the prices of commodities reduced to a fair level by the process of putting up new capital to be bought out by old? If there is no buying out, if the new fights the old and the old fights the new to the death, says Mr. Andrews,

"it is a battle of Titans, of bull-dogs. The signal for letting go is likely to be death, not pain or a little blood. So vast the stake, each side is pushed on by every economic consideration to make the struggle one for victory or annihilation. . . . Either of two results must take place: faint-heartedness may bring truce, or one or the other of the two gladiators may utterly succumb. In either case monopoly is resumed again."

In short, the economic laws which govern when the case is that of blacksmiths and cobblers and gardeners, or of any vocation in life as it existed fifty years ago, do not apply to modern trades in which machinery plays the greater part in production, and where millions of dollars are required to bring the machinery into existence and into play.

Mr. Andrews does not enter into the ethical considerations involved in the subject of Trusts. He denies with emphasis, however, that Trusts and combinations have any tendency to invent or to practise economies, or to share such economies as they may make with the public. They may do so in isolated cases, but there is nothing in their constitution, or in the constitution of things, that can be called a tendency that way. On the contrary, the tendencies are exactly the opposite, for "monopoly prices are determined not by the cost of production, but by the tolerance of the market, by what the market will bear"; and, moreover, "prices, under the law of the tolerance of the market, while never lower than cost, range more or less above, according as the articles approach more the nature of necessities or that of luxuries." Necessities will, of course, bear the higher price.

While Mr. Andrews's paper seems to give us a pessimistic outlook, he is by no means alarmed. "Our sole present needs," he says, "are information, courage, and willingness to take new steps in industrial evolution so soon as they are proved to be wise. In the ages past, society has never gotten itself into an imbroglio without somehow finding a way out. It will be so now."

THE NEW TAMMANY'S TRIBULATIONS.

It is less than a year since *Harper's Weekly* (of July 13, 1889) astonished its readers by publishing portraits of Tammany's Big Four —"Dick" Croker, Bourke Cockran, "Tommy" Gilroy, and Mayor Grant—accompanying them with a highly eulogistic article on the "Tammany Hall of To-day." The readers of the *Weekly* were informed that "there is a new Tammany of to-day, and the people know it not," and that this new Tammany was the Big Four whose portraits were published. A column of most flattering biography was devoted to Croker as "a silent, self-contained man," who had "power and personal strength of character, political sagacity, political honesty, great knowledge of individuals, and spotless personal integrity." Almost equal space was given to Cockran, who was said to have "ripe judgment and thorough knowledge of principles and men, handsome presence, polished manners, and a rare gift of eloquence." Gilroy was extolled as a "genial, pleasant, and obliging man, as well as remarkably gifted with business ability," whose "judgment is recognized as invariably sound and excellent" in all matters coming before the Tammany Committee on Organization. Mayor Grant, the public were assured, not only possessed an "established reputation for personal honesty," but also "for trustworthiness as a public official." Finally, the *Weekly* gave a comprehensive certificate of character for the Big Four by saying that the "extent of the power held by the men mentioned as the representatives of Tammany Hall is just now very great," which, being left without any intimation that they had ever done anything to indicate that they would use it for the public good, was perhaps the most extraordinary statement of a most extraordinary article to be found in the columns of *Harper's Weekly*, of all papers in the world.

What is the condition of the new Tammany to-day, just eight months after it was thus handsomely presented to the public? Croker, having used his power as Boss of the new Tammany to get himself appointed to the office of City Chamberlain, the most lucrative sinecure position in the Mayor's gift, has resigned and gone away, because, according to general belief in political circles, he feared he might be summoned to appear before the Senate Investigating Committee, where he would reveal his ignorance of the duties of his office. Gilroy, whom the *Weekly* declared to be so "remarkably gifted with business ability," has been exposed and convicted by the *Evening Post* of an attempt to let the city's paving contracts in violation of the law, and in the interest of a single company, by framing his specifications in such a way as to preclude competition from all other sources. Only after such exposure and conviction did he change his plans. Bourke Cockran's achievements, in demonstration of his claim to the title of a man of "ripe judgment and thorough knowledge of principles and men," have been to get his law partner appointed Corporation Counsel, while he himself is the counsel of the enormous claims which the aqueduct contractors are bringing against the city for work which they have been compelled to perform in accordance with their agreements with the city.

As for the Mayor, what is the condition of his "established reputation for personal honesty and trustworthiness as a public official"? He promised, before taking office, that, in the "exercise of public duties, all my acts must be for the benefit of the whole people"; that, "in the selection of municipal officers, I shall prescribe no other test than honesty and special capacity for the offices to be filled"; that, "profoundly conscious of the importance to my party and to myself of a judicious application of the appointing power, I pledge myself to be guided solely by a determination to secure for the people the very highest order of public servants that the citizenship of the county will afford"; and that, "in exercising the appointing power, I will not be moved by considera-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of personal friendship, nor will I be affected by my individual preferences." He has made about twenty important appointments to salaried positions, and with a single exception every one of them has been a Tammany man, many of them have been mere personal cronies, and all of them have been more or less unfit. He has not made a single choice from the "highest order of the citizenship of the county," and it is a moderate statement to say that nine-tenths of his selections have been from the lowest order. His one reputable appointment, that of Mr. Loomis for Street Commissioner, he completely neutralized by forcing with it the choice of "Eddy" Hagan, a liquor-dealing politician of the lowest type, as Deputy. The result of this performance, which is now universally regarded as a cheap trick, is that Mr. Loomis is on the point of resigning in discouragement and disgust, while our streets are in a worse condition than ever.

In addition to these failures of the Big Four to live up to the handsome "characters" given them by *Harper's Weekly*, there are the tribulations of Tammany's former Grand Sachem, the Sheriff. Not only is he on trial in court on a charge of criminal conspiracy for seeking to get a divorce from his wife by methods forbidden by the law, but his deputy has also been indicted for bribery, in company with another Tammany leader, the Warden of Ludlow Street Jail. In fact, the office which has charge of the city's criminals is itself shown to be conducted by criminals and to be in league with criminals.

There is nothing surprising in all this. The new Tammany, like the old Tammany, is merely fulfilling its mission. It exists solely for the control of offices and patronage. Nothing else is thought of or talked of in its committees or at its meetings. Questions of municipal administration and government are never discussed there. The only object of the society is to make politics as extravagant and corrupt as possible in order that there may be more "plums" to divide. Every public work and improvement is looked at, not from the point of view of the city's interests, but simply as a job for the benefit of Tammany. These are such trite truths that it ought not to be necessary to repeat them, and it would not be if every now and then reputable journals like Harper's *Weekly*, and reputable men like Mr. Loomis, did not give sanction to the idea that in some way something good and of public usefulness might come out of Tammany if honest men would encourage it with their approval or alliance. Mr. Loomis has learned the folly of it by bitter experience. No reputable man can ally himself with it and not repent of his mistake. All its leaders are of the same calibre and character. The Sheriff, who is on trial, was its Grand Sachem. The Warden of Ludlow Street Jail is a member of its Committee of Twenty-four on Organization, whose executive officers are the Big Four. From top to bottom, the men are all of the same character—they are all political speculators and gamblers; most of them have never had any occupation except politics; many of them have been and still are liquor-dealers, and the great majority are ignorant, vicious, corrupt, and depraved. To pretend that decent government can spring from such sources is worse than foolish.

A SAMPLE OF TAMMANY GOVERNMENT.

THE Senate Committee demonstrated the wisdom of its new departure in investigation methods at its session on Saturday. The revelations which it extracted from Mayor Grant concerning the way in which the business of the Sheriff's office was administered during his term therein, are precisely what the public needs and what it is the first duty of such a committee to furnish. Nobody cares for the views of Mayor Grant or any other Tammany statesman upon the structure of the municipal government, but it is of the greatest public interest to have a clear showing made of the manner in which Tammany's highest municipal official conducted one great office before he was promoted to another. This is what was done on Saturday, and the revelation was so important as an object-lesson for our citizens that we shall sum up its chief features in as concise and dispassionate a manner as possible.

The magnitude of the office of Sheriff appears in the Mayor's testimony that the suits against the Sheriff sometimes aggregate $10,000,000 a year, and that his receipts from fees aggregate somewhere between $25,000 and $30,000 a year. Yet there was no book kept which would tell exactly what the receipts were. While he was Sheriff Mr. Grant kept none. It was possible that all the books in the office might give the total if a bookkeeper were to go over all of them. When Mr. Grant became Sheriff, there were forty-two deputy sheriffs, but he reduced the number to thirteen. Did he do that "because he thought it was better to have thirteen well-fed men than forty-two hungry and thirsty ones"? "Well, that's about it," said Mr. Grant. The fees of the offices were divided by the Mayor with these thirteen deputies after the latter had collected them. No books or records of any kind were kept of the amounts collected. Mr. Grant himself made no distinction between his private and official bank accounts. He had a schedule of fees which the deputies were to collect, which he had had prepared by his counsel, Bourke Cockran, for their guidance. He took the money which they brought to him, deposited it, and kept what remained after he had paid over their shares to them. He had no check upon their operations, but kept a close watch upon them, and if he caught one of them charging illegal fees, he discharged him. The deputies attended to all cases in which the execution was on judgments not exceeding $20,000. All others were attended to by the Sheriff or the Under-Sheriff.

The law allows that in certain cases the deputies may receive as "extra compensation" such sums as may be agreed upon between them and the attorney for the judgment. Mr. Grant kept no record of transactions of this kind. He was aware that great abuses, and even systematic blackmail, might be practised by the deputies under the pretence of "extra compensation," but he kept no check upon them and no record of their receipts from this source. If there was any controversy between a deputy and an attorney over such a charge, the deputy took the advice of Bourke Cockran, and for this service each of the thirteen deputies paid Mr. Cockran $35 a month. If after Mr. Cockran's advice had been followed, the attorney for the judgment still objected, Mr. Grant sent the matter before a judge for decision.

When Mr. Grant became Sheriff, he found that there had been many complaints about the way in which Sheriff's sales were conducted. He thereupon summoned an old auctioneer, Mr. Topping, and told him he wished to put all these sales in his charge, guaranteeing him adequate compensation and taking for himself half his fees. Was he as Sheriff aware of the fact that he had no legal right to charge auctioneers' fees? Technically, he knew, he had no such right, but the "auctioneer generally disposed of the goods to such advantage that the creditor was usually willing to pay him something for his services." As Sheriff he received between $4,000 and $5,000 from this source during the last year of his term. He was not certain whether or not it was the custom to charge auctioneers' fees in all bills—he was inclined to think not, but would not swear that it was not. Yet he had made an agreement at the beginning of his term that he should receive half of them. When asked by Mr. Ivins, "Was it not your duty as Sheriff under the law to sell the goods without fee?" Mr. Grant hesitated for some time, and finally replied: "I understand that it was the Sheriff who done the sale. It was the services that the Sheriff rendered for which we were compensated." This was the clearest explanation which could be obtained.

These were the main points of the Mayor's testimony. What they revealed is too plain to need much comment. They showed, in the first place, that utter lack of ordinary business methods which is always found in a department in which there are transactions that will not bear the light. In the second place, they show that in two most important respects the law was violated, in one case somewhat indirectly and in the other openly. Every lawyer in the city knows how uniform the charge of "extra compensation" has become, and what an organized system of blackmail it is upon all legal business which comes before the Sheriff's office. That it is directed by Bourke Cockran, who receives from the deputies who levy it about $6,000 a year as "counsel fees," is a new revelation. The income of a deputy is about $3,000 a year, and of this amount he must hand over $35 a month, or more than one-seventh, to Mr. Cockran, as counsel, not for services actually rendered, but as a retaining fee. This disclosure throws a strong light upon Mr. Cockran's functions in the municipal govern-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. To how many other employees does he hold this relation of compulsory counsel, and what is the gross income which he receives in that way? He was the Mayor's counsel while the latter was Sheriff, and it now appears that the Mayor made Mr. Cockran's law partner Corporation Counsel not because of the partner's services, but because of Mr. Cockran's. In addition to being general counsel for the Mayor and innumerable Tammany employees, Mr. Cockran has his partner as the city's official legal adviser, while he himself is the counsel of the heaviest claimants against the city.

The auctioneers' fee revelations are full as damaging as those of the "extra-compensation" practice. The Mayor admits that he made himself the partner in a plan to levy such fees when he recounts his bargain with Mr. Topping, and in doing so he seems to have committed an indictable offence. The two practices together place the city in the attitude of levying illegal tribute upon all its Sheriff sales, and upon all litigants who are forced to transact business through the Sheriff's office. In this respect the conduct of the office, which is nominally a county office, becomes a matter of the highest municipal interest, for the city and county are one, and the sufferers from such abuses are the inhabitants of the city.

CLERICAL JESTING.

A SURPRISING feature of the Presbyterian debates on the revision of the Creed has been the great number of witticisms evolved in the discussions. In the New York Presbytery in particular many of the debaters seemed to feel that they must be funny in direct proportion to the awfulness of the doctrines they were considering. Doubtless the presence of a throng in the galleries, where it was so easy to awake the convincing approval of a laugh, had something to do with this; but it is not to be supposed that men with such good stories and witty epithets struggling for utterance would have kept them all down even if the public had not been there. Especially is there reason to believe that the amusing illustration of the dog having eaten up his tag, and all the ingenious turns given it by successive speakers, was bound to furnish all the diversion it did whether men would hear or forbear. The thing itself is of no great importance except as a striking instance of what is a new and important thing—the intrusion of humor into pulpit oratory. To what an extent this has gone may be pretty clearly inferred from the fact that ministers could not rise to discuss what they all believed to be the most solemn subjects, before a miscellaneous audience, without adorning their remarks with jokes.

Of course, there have always been clerical humorists, men born to see the laughable aspects and relations of things, known far and wide as jolly story-tellers or inveterate jesters. The very sacredness of their profession, and the traditional sedateness to which it was supposed to bind them, have lent piquancy and the merit of unexpectedness to their wit. Occasionally they may have indulged in some quip in the pulpit itself, though this was surely very seldom, and would have been esteemed wholly irregular and out of keeping. Indeed, the whole class have always been looked upon, till lately, as a doubtful honor to the cloth, more to be tolerated than commended. But we have changed all that. Nothing is commoner in a church nowadays than the subdued and decorous ripple of laughter at some witty observation of the preacher. We do not allude to the isolated instances of ministerial buffoons, but to the general freedom which a minister now may feel to say "bright" things in the pulpit, if he can, and to excite the risibilities of his hearers in a way that would certainly have called the indignant tithing-man down upon them two centuries ago.

The growth of this tendency is no doubt partly due to the slow secularization of the ministry all along the line. It can no longer stand apart from all other callings, as upon a pedestal of peculiar sacredness. As it becomes more assimilated to the prevailing conditions of life and society, it naturally assumes more and more of their tone and methods. Partly, and perhaps more, the tendency is due to the desire to win attention which cannot any more be commanded. It is all of a piece with the entire recasting of the minister's personality that has come about. The historical figure of the New England parson, stalking majestically along the street, at once the dread and awe of childhood, has given way, in large degree, to a romping, tennis-playing personage, whose advent the children hail with delight as that of a jolly big brother sportively inclined. Bound to be agreeable and amusing all the week, what wonder if he puts the spice of a jest also into his Sunday's discourse?

Certainly he has to face no popular condemnation for so doing. Commendation rather is the result. No ministers are more secure in their positions than those who have the reputation of being witty in the pulpit—"so bright" or "so lively," as they are admiringly declared to be by attached parishioners. Hence it gives one a sort of shock to read in the *Christian Union* a rebuke of those Presbyterians who are giving such a mirthful turn to the discussions about their creed. Of course, in the eyes of Presbyterians, the religious journal named stands for all that is radical and dangerous in doctrine, and so it is to be feared that the rebuke will pass by them unheeded. Yet they ought to give attention to it. The *Christian Union* is right. Call it mystery, reverence, awe, or what one will, there is something of the kind necessary to the preservation of the religious instincts, and those sentiments cannot long survive flippant treatment. Prophets do not play tennis nor make jokes. The Jews were much given to punning, but it was all meant most seriously, and has had, in fact, most serious consequences. The Apostolic prohibition of foolish talking and jesting is not greatly honored in general, but it might well be observed in the pulpit for a while yet.

PUBLIC DEMANDS AND THE MEDICAL EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

BALTIMORE, March 7, 1890.

THE present condition of that department of higher education known as the medical education of women offers a curious instance of social congestion, consequent upon the rapid growth of advanced popular views on the practical side, without a corresponding expansion of opinion on the scientific and academic side. At the moment of writing, two State Legislatures, those of New York and Kentucky, have before them bills requiring the appointment of women assistant physicians in all insane asylums where women are confined, while in Massachusetts and in our neighboring State of Pennsylvania such appointments have for some years been provided for by law. In as many as ten other States, where legislation has not as yet enforced such action, appointments of women physicians in insane asylums have been voluntarily made, and in instances too many to enumerate, in different parts of the country, popular agitation has secured the services of women in the female wards of city almshouses, in prisons and reformatories, and in some hospitals and dispensaries, as well as in infant asylums and girls' homes.

But while the public is thus on all sides demanding, with no uncertain sound, the appointment of women physicians in institutions where women and girls are received, and is proving its honest conviction that the employment of women physicians is right and decent by using the services of such physicians in domestic life, it has neglected to offer medical women the same careful preparation and advanced instruction that are provided for the corresponding class of men. The contest is now no longer for the right of women to practise medicine, but for their right to be properly trained to practise it. The number of State and other appointments above instanced, and the statistics in regard to the number (over 2,500) of women practising medicine in the United States, together with their respective positions and incomes, sufficiently demonstrate the attitude of public opinion in regard to the desirability of women as physicians. These same facts can be shown to prove that it is clearly the interest of the community to give to women medical students and women physicians the same apprenticeship and instruction that it provides for men.

Similar responsibilities require similar preparation. Neither common sense nor justice sustains the public in insisting by law on the selection of specified members of a profession whom in its social and educational functions it pronounces incompetent and inferior. If women physicians are to be given their proportion of State appointments, if the female wards of the State are entitled to the services of physicians of their own sex, then those medical women have a right to exactly the same opportunities for training that medical men have. That they have not these opportunities merely shows that we have allowed zeal to outrun discretion. What we need is a little less zeal and a quickened sense of justice.

"The positions open to women in institutions to-day far outnumber the available women who are properly prepared. The most urgent need of to-day is the opportunity for women to study in the best colleges for men, and in hospitals which admit all cases. Men respect a diploma from a school which also graduates men much more than one from a school exclusively for women, and I believe that those women who study with men are best fitted to work beside and under them afterwards. Women educated by themselves are less broad in their ideas, I am sure."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These words of an able woman physician indicate the lines on which the battle for the medical education of women must be fought. They point, first, to the opening of the medical departments of our great universities, with all their scientific and clinical advantages, to properly qualified women, and, secondly, to a fair division between men and women of hospital and dispensary appointments.

At present the half-dozen medical schools whose endowment and equipment enable them to demand a high standard from their students, and to provide a scheme of instruction abreast of the scientific knowledge of the age, still say sternly to women, "Go and get the best instruction you can somewhere else." Were they to reverse their verdict, they would merely be following tardily in the tardy footsteps of the principal degree-conferring medical bodies of Great Britain, and the existing schools of medicine on the Continent. Many well qualified judges of the matter in this country already hold that separate laboratories and dissecting-rooms, with separate instruction in one or two special subjects, are all that is needed in order to admit women, without friction or complication, to the best-equipped medical schools. But hospital appointments are where the shoe pinches with men, even the most liberal. Such positions are so coveted, and their value so keenly appreciated, that only a growing sense of justice and the outside pressure of public opinion will secure for women and men an equal share in their distribution. Of the hundreds of American hospitals and dispensaries, both public and private, where women and children are treated, few employ women physicians, yet such minor posts as those of interne and assistant physician are the natural stepping-stones to the more important places on a medical staff, and are indispensable for post-graduate study. As internes and as assistants in institutions, women physicians present no more difficulties to honest and competent authorities than do boys and girls in the same families, and with different rooms and habits, to wise and capable parents. The proper arrangements can be and have been made to accommodate and train members of both sexes under the same central administration.

Higher medical education in general is a very recent movement. It was only in 1872 that Harvard announced an extended and graded course of instruction. Not until 1878 did the University of Pennsylvania follow suit, being only enabled to do so then by the endowment of several chairs, the first of which, that of surgery, owed its existence to the liberality of a woman, who gave $50,000 for its foundation. Johns Hopkins has not yet perfected the plans for its medical school, but it is admitted that until some additional or special endowment be received, none but post-graduate instruction and some undergraduate biological and chemical courses will be offered to medical students.

A survey of the advances and recoils of medical education for women discloses two salient forces to be routed and conciliated, namely, the spoils system of politics, which makes it easy to oust or put down a woman, and endowment. The purification of office-holding will progress slowly with the general increase of civic virtue and intelligence. Endowment is the more certain hope of those who are impatient to force our university schools to retire from their present position towards women medical students. Recent information from Harvard foreshadows willingness on the part of both Overseers and Faculty to receive such gifts as would permit them to take action on the final hedging resolution of 1879 over Miss Marian Hovey's offer of $10,000, *i. e.*, "That, in the opinion of the Board of Overseers it is expedient that, under suitable restrictions, women be instructed by Harvard University in its Medical School." The Johns Hopkins Hospital, in organic connection with the University, has this year admitted several women to its post-graduate instruction.

Women need not despair. The trend of university movement and development is on their side. It is the interest of the public to hasten this development by such additional endowment as will secure for its medical servants, irrespective of sex, the best training.

C. B.

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE OPPOSITION IN PARLIAMENT.

LONDON, March 5, 1890.

THERE is a general impression that the present session of Parliament may probably be more critical and exciting than its immediate predecessors. The last two sessions have been chiefly occupied with schemes of local government for England and Scotland, the main principles of which were, to say the least, as acceptable to the Opposition as to the followers of the Government. The Opposition desired to extend the application of these principles much further, and there was abundant material for controversy in detail, but there was no serious party contest over those measures, and no practical possibility of the Government being either forced or having any inducement to appeal to the country.

The situation is now different. The present Parliament has attained or passed its climacteric. Willingly or unwillingly, the Government are now about to take a forward step in their Irish policy. They always announced from the first, with varying degrees of precision, that while they deemed repressive legislation to be indispensable, it would be accompanied, or at least closely followed, by constructive measures of reform in the direction of giving facilities to occupiers to become owners—land purchase as it is commonly called—and more particularly of local government on the same principles as were to be applied, and now have been applied, to Great Britain. Those promises were doubtless made, among other things, as a condition of the Liberal-Unionist alliance. It was a form of marriage to soothe the scruples of these new allies, and enable them with a calm conscience to live under the protection of the Tories. The disturbed state of Ireland even more than the pressure of other business has hitherto been the excuse for doing nothing to redeem those pledges. But now the Government boast that their administration of the Crimes Act has been successful in restoring order and tranquillity. Accordingly, whether the Liberal Unionists, as a compacting party, are pressing for a fulfilment of the compact or not, the Government could no longer evade the task of attempting a constructive policy, and measures of Irish land purchase and local government were announced in the Queen's speech.

The first important business of the session, however, is the debate now proceeding on the report of the Parnell Commission. I dare say your readers are almost as familiar with the report as people in England, and as able to draw their own conclusions from it. The findings of the Commission do not contain anything that is new, and the report has not in itself produced any excitement in the public mind. Mr. Parnell and his colleagues are acquitted of the gross charges of personal complicity with murder and other crimes, and association with criminals, which were persistently levelled at them by the *Times*, and were the sole origin of the Commission. This acquittal was partly discounted after the exposure of the Pigott forgeries, but it is more complete and emphatic than was generally expected. Not a few of the accused persons are found guilty of a treasonable purpose to establish the independence of Ireland. But that purpose and their conversion from it have been avowed, and by public opinion in this country even beyond the limits of the Liberal party the treason is long ago excused, forgiven, and almost forgotten.

There remains the condemnation passed by the Commissioners on the part which Mr. Parnell and his friends took in the Irish agitation, under such heads as incitement to intimidation which in fact was followed by crime, and acceptance of aid from the Physical Force party in America, and, as the price of such aid, abstaining from any condemnation of the action of the party. Of this part of the report it is enough to say that, so far as it carries general conviction, it deals with facts which have always been perfectly well known, and for which, in loss of estimation and damage to their cause, the Irish Nationalist party has, whatever over-zealous supporters may say or think, already paid a heavy and probably the full penalty. But the most marked result of the publication of the report is this: with a few honorable exceptions which throw the conduct of the majority into darker relief, Tory politicians and the Tory press, including the *Times*, instead of frankly acknowledging that what was new was not true, and what was true was not new, represent that the report practically affirms the charges of the *Times*, and proves the Nationalist members to be a pack of traitors and scoundrels. The warm indignation which this attitude has excited among the Liberals is reflected in the amendment which Mr. Gladstone moved on Monday, and it is possible that the debate will cause a more active interest in the report than its publication has yet excited.

But the chief interest and business of the session will be the Land-Purchase Bill. The Local-Government Bill, as was to be expected, is also mentioned in the speech from the throne. If land purchase is specially acceptable to some supporters of the Government, local government is the favorite panacea of others who will prescribe anything for Ireland except what she wants. The bill is described in the speech as one for "extending to Ireland the principles of local self-government which have already been adopted in England and Scotland, so far as they are applicable to that country." But it is not believed that the Government hope to pass a local-government bill this session, if they even expect to do so during the present Parliament. There are many reasons which may have disposed the Government to give land purchase the precedence. It is true that a measure of local government which proceeded honestly and fully on the lines of the English and Scotch Acts, establishing county councils on a popular franchise, would not be opposed by the Liberal party. Mr. Gladstone has repeatedly said that he would welcome and do what he could to assist such a bill. Liberal politicians might even be found who think that a good bill of that kind would take some wind out of the sails of the Opposition. But it would be looked upon with great alarm and suspicion by many followers of the Government, Irish and English, and, so long as they are sincerely bent on opposing any rational form of self-government, it is obvious that in a genuine system of local government they might be setting up a Frank-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enstein, and providing an organization for securing home rule stronger than the Land League ever was or could be.

Land purchase, on the other hand, has solid attractions for the Irish landlords, a class which includes not a few influential members of the English aristocracy and other wealthy men on this side of the Irish Channel. They are not disinclined to be bought out by the British taxpayer. It is at least possible for the Tory party to believe that the establishment of the tenants on the soil as owners would draw them away from the desire for home rule. And the discussion of a land-purchase bill even more than a local-government bill promises chances of embarrassment to the Opposition. The Liberal leaders are committed to the expediency of a general scheme of land purchase. The Land-Purchase Bill of 1886 was an essential part of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy. The plan was based primarily on Irish credit, but it was secured by British credit involving in theory a contingent liability which was estimated at a hundred and fifty millions. The scheme was not universally accepted even by Liberals throughout the country. In some Liberal constituencies it was emphatically condemned. So that the Government approach the question with this tactical advantage, that while the Opposition are committed to the principle, they are also identified with a plan which they are not likely to propose again. The Government, however, will have their own difficulties in framing a plan. In 1885 they obtained five millions by the Ashbourne Act for this purpose, and again other five millions last year, in spite of the opposition of the Liberals, who objected to making the State the immediate creditor of the farmer, and also to the money being doled out by Parliament in driblets, which led to partiality in the operation of the Act and the incidence of its benefits, without the result of any general improvement in the situation of the occupiers. The Government are also so far hampered by their own criticisms on Mr. Gladstone's bill. The opposition which their supporters, especially the Liberal Unionists, helped to raise against the employment of British credit on a large scale for Irish purposes, contributed materially to the rejection of Mr. Gladstone's policy as a whole. To devise an effectual scheme which will throw no contingent burden on the British taxpayer, will not be an easy task.

In entering on a new phase of the struggle, the two armies find themselves with forces within the House of Commons and fighting arrangements practically unchanged. The Cabinet has been increased, by the appointment of Mr. Chaplin to the new Ministry of Agriculture, to the unusually large number of seventeen. So unwieldy a Cabinet almost necessarily implies the existence of an inner Cabinet, which some observers think is silently developing into an established institution, just as the Cabinet itself did. Mr. W. H. Smith continues to lead the House, *tant bien que mal*. The frequent rumors of his approaching retirement are probably without foundation so long as his health stands, and it now appears to be excellent. If he comes short of an ideal leader in a position certainly unsought by him, yet it would be difficult for his party to replace him. Mr. Balfour, who could fill the place well, cannot be spared from Ireland, and, notwithstanding Mr. Goschen's great abilities, it is not believed in any quarter that his leadership would tend to the smooth transaction of business. On the other side, Mr. Gladstone is exceptionally vigorous, and evidently full of confidence and hope. His followers are extremely anxious that he should spare himself, and, in his necessary absence from the House during long and late hours, there has occasionally been a slackness in the leadership, and the party have felt themselves like sheep without a shepherd. This was likely to happen when there was no single lieutenant who would or could assert an unquestioned claim to be second in command. There are signs, however, that this session, under the joint lieutenancy of Sir William Harcourt and Mr. John Morley, the party will be better led when in front of the enemy.

In the present situation, at the opening of a critical session, there are certain points which the Government may reasonably count as being in their favor. The Liberal-Unionist alliance is unbroken. It is not likely to be tried by a severer strain than it has already more than once resisted. Here and there the Liberal Unionists may have made their influence felt in the legislation of the past three years, but they have fully realized that their political existence depends on their supporting the Government through thick and thin. This advantage the Government have always had, though they may reckon on it now with more confidence. Another point is the freedom from serious foreign complications which the country enjoys. The foreign policy of the Government has been fairly successful. Another point of still greater importance is the improvement of the revenues. After a long period of depression, trade is reviving and the revenue is expanding. The revival has already enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to present two budgets which were open to criticism on important points, but which had the great attraction of showing a balance on the right side. This year the budget will be better than its predecessors, and the country, after discussing next month the disposal of a surplus of three millions, will come in a good humor to the consideration of the Government bills.

Another point is a certain improvement in the condition of Ireland. The Government will maintain that they have restored tranquillity and prosperity by a policy of firm government. It is quite true that agrarian crime, which did not stand at a high figure when the Crimes Act was passed, has still further diminished, and that there are signs that farmers are beginning to have better times. So far as social order is concerned, coercion acts have always been successful in putting down crime for the time, but they have naturally deepened the disaffection of the people to the Government. Another cause of improvement is that the Irish Nationalists now hope everything from the good will of the English and Scottish people, and their leaders exert all their influence in the direction of conciliation. As to the farmers, a cycle of bad harvests has been succeeded by two good harvests and improved prices, and in a purely agricultural country like Ireland the general prosperity is immediately dependent on the harvests and the prices of agricultural produce. Thus, in fighting the battle of their policy in Ireland, there are certain not unimportant respects in which surrounding circumstances, so far as any aid can come from them, are at this moment favorable to the Government. This aspect of the situation, together with the difficult and delicate character of the proposed Irish bills, was enough to suggest the probability of a dissolution at the close of this session, and the rumor has more than once been current. The Government might think that no more opportune moment was likely to come, and that if they could again obtain a majority, they would be able to deal with Ireland with a much more confident hand.

There is, however, another side to the picture which may and probably does prevent the Government from forming any definite purpose of dissolution. The belief that the cause of Irish home rule is gaining ground in the country has, I think, been more general during the last few months than it ever was before. The growth of this belief has been partly due to the general success of the Liberal party in a representative group of by-elections which took place in the autumn in various parts of the country. By many people, not all on the same side of politics, conclusions which were probably too hasty were drawn. It was thought that the boat which had been moved on the beach by inches with great effort, was now to slide to the sea with a rush. Even the result of the recent vacancy at Partick, where, in a constituency under 11,000, the Unionist majority was reduced by 600 and the Liberal vote increased by 1,000, was felt to be a check. Expectations are already more sober. But the victory in St. Pancras, by which another seat has been wrested from the Tories, is a great encouragement to their opponents. In London many seats were lost in 1886, and if the tables are to be turned, many seats in London must be won by the Liberals at the next elections. The poll was much heavier than at either of the last two elections, and in a comparatively small constituency a minority of 261 was transformed into a majority of 108. The majority is not large, but it is taken by the Liberals as a hopeful indication that the tide in London has turned, and it has some special importance as expressing the first verdict of the electorate after the publication of the Parnell Commission. Two other by-elections are impending, one a Conservative, the other a Liberal seat. But the majorities at the last elections were so large in both cases that it is hardly probable that the result will alter the numerical strength of parties.

C. D.

ON THE EVE OF THE NEW CABINET.

PARIS, March 7, 1890.

IT is not very easy to analyze exactly the political situation in France at the present moment. Last year the election of Gen. Boulanger in Paris by an overwhelming vote marked the downfall of the radical Cabinet presided over by M. Floquet. The radicals had, so to speak, invented Gen. Boulanger; they had put him in the Ministry of War and given him popularity; they considered him as their right-hand man. They had unconsciously prepared the way for his programme by advocating a revision of the Republican Constitution. This word "revision" became the cry of all factions of the Opposition, and when Boulanger turned against his old friends, he used it freely. Under this vague and equivocal word, the Boulangists, the royalists, and the Bonapartists made war together upon the Government; they formed a coalition which had no avowed object, no definite aim, but which was all the more dangerous on this account.

How was the danger averted? The radical Administration gave place to a new Administration, in which the most important leader was M. Constans, who had been one of the followers of Gambetta, and had placed himself among those republicans who call themselves Opportunists. He had for some years been Governor of our colonies in Cochin China, in Tonquin, and in Annam, and had learned there to govern with decision and with an unopposed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority. Among so many lawyers and orators, he was thought to be a man of action. Many stories were told of his youth, of the years spent in Spain during the Empire; but these stories, whether true or false, all went to confirm his reputation for a certain courage not unmixed with contempt for formalities and even for legality.

When M. Constans took the Home Office, his task was not easy. He had a two-fold object: he had to make war on Boulanger and on Boulangism, he had to preside over the general elections; and whoever is familiar with our history and our institutions knows how influential the prefectoral administration is in the general elections. He would probably not have succeeded if the republican party had not abandoned the *scrutin de liste* and returned to the *scrutin d'arrondissement*. No amount of administrative pressure would have prevented the success in a number of departments of general tickets headed by the then popular name of General Boulanger. The Chamber felt the danger; not only did it return to the district ticket, which prevented the sort of plébiscite that Boulanger was aiming at, but a law was passed which made it illegal for a candidate to stand in more than one arrondissement. These measures were not sufficient; it was thought that no amount of legislative precautions could prevent the final triumph of Boulanger, if he remained free to go about and speak in every city of France, to agitate the country without intermission, here giving hope to the royalists, there encouraging the radicals, and everywhere threatening a total revision of the present Constitution. It was resolved to proscribe him, and to accuse him of conspiracy against the Government. "Morte la bête, mort le venin," says an old French proverb. The *bête* was not killed, it simply fled.

I will not here discuss the legality of all the proceedings which ended in the final and almost complete discomfiture of Boulangism; one fact is certain, the Home Minister, Constans, was the man who conducted the campaign. He can say, "Ecce, adsum qui feci." He was rewarded by republican successes in the elections. The monarchical minority is not as strong in the new Chamber as it was in the last; it is, besides, somewhat weakened by the memory of the coalition of the Conservative party with Boulanger, and not only with Boulanger, but with Rochefort and the Communists.

The trial of Boulanger and the Exhibition were the two great events of 1889. The Exhibition certainly helped M. Constans; it marked a sort of truce during which passions were allowed to cool. It seemed also like a triumphant apotheosis of the Republic. M. Carnot performed with great dignity his Presidential function, and received all the visitors of France in a way becoming our country. It seemed really as if we were entering on a new era of progress, of union and peace. The proverb "Sic vos non vobis" was, however, soon justified. When the new Chamber met, it seemed as if the Cabinet had nothing to do but to watch quietly over its deliberations. Nobody was prepared to upset it or to undertake to succeed it. The only man of mark in the republican camp who could have presumed to be ambitious of the premiership, M. Jules Ferry, had lost his election. M. Floquet, the radical ex-Premier, had been elected Speaker. There were no greater stars in the House than the present Ministers, and it seemed as if the period of perpetual ministerial changes had come to an end.

The character of the new Chamber was not at first clearly defined—was it moderate, disposed to be tolerant of the minority? or was it, like its predecessor, inclined to be arbitrary, unjust, and even violent? Many people had hoped that the moderate republicans would be the leaders of the new Chamber. Some of them are men of great talent, good orators, and have at their disposition papers which rank among the best in the country, such as the *Journal des Débats*. Nobody had attacked the radicals with more eloquence and force than this last paper, which is generally inspired by one of its proprietors, M. Léon Say, the ex-Minister of Finance, the grandson of the famous economist. The London *Times* had gone so far as to announce that M. Léon Say and his followers would come to power as a natural consequence of the general elections.

The Cabinet in which M. Constans was the Home Minister was not quite homogeneous. Some of its members were Opportunists—republicans of the Gambetta and Jules Ferry school; some of them were radicals. They had, however, worked harmoniously during the struggle against Boulanger and during the period of the Exposition. But, now that they confronted a new Chamber, was it possible for them to remain united? M. Carnot, the President, was unwilling to change the Cabinet, probably from a feeling of gratitude for the services which it had rendered, probably also because he could not well divine the exact temper of the new House, and again, people say, because he feels a great sympathy and affection for M. Tirard, who holds the Premiership.

The temper of the Chamber was first shown in what is called here the validation of the elections. The greatest severity was exhibited towards some of the Conservative, and especially the Boulangist, deputies elected in Paris. On the most futile pretexts, the election of many deputies was invalidated. The new elections which were thus rendered necessary did not always change the verdict of the electors. In Paris, for instance, all the invalidated deputies were reëlected. It is a great pity that there is no special tribunal for these electoral disputes; the Chamber has no qualification for the performance of this delicate office, and, in almost every contested election, its decision is inspired merely by party spirit.

Meanwhile, the divisions in the Cabinet, which had long been occult, became more manifest; the Chamber became aware, a short time after its meeting, that M. Tirard, the Premier, and M. Constans, the Home Minister, disagreed on many questions. An incident brought this antagonism before the public. The Duke of Orleans, on arriving at the age of twenty-one, came to Paris, and offered himself as a "conscript" with the young men of his age. He was placed between two laws, one personal to him, which exiled him from France, another, a general law, which subjects every Frenchman to military service, with a few exceptions in which he was not comprised. He had lost his political rights, but he preserved his civic rights; and the right to do military service may be called a civic right. I will not argue here a question which the lawyers employed by the Duke of Orleans did not themselves argue at length before the tribunal. I will look on the question only from the point of view of the Government. M. Constans from the first moment felt that if the judgment of the public would not be with the Duke of Orleans, at least the sentiment of the public would be with him. He thought it unwise to treat with severity the act of a young man, an exile, who chose the best way he could to return for a moment to his country. M. Constans wished to take the Duke of Orleans immediately to the frontier, and not to give him the advantage of being a victim of the law of exile. On this delicate question the division of the Cabinet became apparent; it became even more so when the question of pardoning the Duke of Orleans had to be discussed after the tribunal had condemned him to two years' imprisonment. The Duke had eleven days if he chose for putting in an appeal, and during those eleven days the question of pardon was constantly discussed. It was finally decided against the opinion of M. Constans, and, when the delay of eleven days was over, the young Prince had to leave the Conciergerie, and was conveyed to Clairvaux, a prison for common criminals.

During all this period, the Chamber manifested its hostility to the Duke of Orleans, and M. Constans soon felt that he was losing its confidence. He seized the first opportunity, the nomination of the President of the Court of Cassation, and offered his resignation to M. Carnot. To the surprise of all, this resignation did not become the signal for a ministerial change. M. Constans was immediately replaced, and by whom? By a M. Bourgeois, a radical deputy, who, before he accepted, asked permission of M. Floquet, the present Speaker, whose under-secretary he had been when M. Floquet was Home Minister. The radical element is therefore strengthened in the Cabinet, especially as M. Bourgeois, on assuming office, made a declaration to the Chamber which had a decided radical tinge.

All the details I have given tend, therefore, to the same end: the new Chamber will not be a moderate Chamber in comparison with its predecessor; it is really more radical; it contains more mediocrities; it is no longer under the guidance of such men as M. Ferry or M. Constans. It wants new leaders, new radical leaders.

Correspondence.

COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN WISCONSIN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The last Legislature of Wisconsin certainly, if it did nothing else, secured itself from oblivion when it passed the Bennet Law. Unwittingly and unsuspectingly, in the last days of the session, it passed this law without debate or question. It went to its third reading without comment or opposition, and received the prompt and ready acquiescence of the Executive. Yet this measure has raised an issue fraught with more bitterness, more of race animosity, more of religious antagonism, than was ever known in Wisconsin before. It has unsettled political values, placed the reelection of a Republican Executive in jeopardy, and has caused the leaders of the dominant party the gravest uneasiness.

To understand the situation clearly, it must be recollected that there are 350,000 Roman Catholics in this State; that, with a total Presidential vote in 1888 of 354,514, there are from 50,000 to 60,000 Catholic votes and about 40,000 Lutheran votes; that the German Lutherans and a large proportion of the German Catholics have been unwavering adherents of the Republican party. Yet here we have a law against which every Lutheran synod, every Lutheran minister, every German paper (secular and religious), almost without exception, is up in arms. We have the Archbishop and the Bishops of Green Bay and La Crosse issuing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their solemn manifesto against the law, and calling upon the believers in the Catholic faith to vote and work for its repeal. The children of Luther and the children of the Pope have for the first time made common cause, and, under a common flag, declared war against what they call an unjust, unnecessary, and unlawful enactment.

The law which has caused all this commotion is said to be mainly a copy of the Illinois law, which in turn is said to have been taken from the New York and Massachusetts enactments. Its purpose, so the person who drafted it has told me, was to turn the children from the workshop into the schools, and to provide authority for the school boards to force truant children into the schoolhouses. Its title is "An Act concerning the education and employment of children." Briefly summarized, its provisions are as follows:

Section 1 provides that children between seven and fourteen shall attend some public or private day school at least twelve weeks in each year *in the city, ward, or district where he resides.* Attendance to be consecutive; number of weeks, to be fixed by the Board of Education, *not to exceed twenty-four.*

Section 2 provides a penalty for non-compliance, and allows an excuse from the school authorities on the ground of inability of the parents, physical or mental incompetence, *and on proof being shown that instruction has otherwise been given for a like period of time in the elementary branches commonly taught in the public schools*, or that the child has acquired such elementary branches.

Section 3. Penalties.

Section 4 provides for prosecutions by the Board of Education.

"Section 5. No school shall be regarded as a school, under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history in the English language."

Section 6 provides that prosecutions shall be begun only by the school boards, etc.

Section 7 gives jurisdiction to justices of the peace and police magistrates.

Section 8 defines what is a "truant child," and provides for forcing it into educational institutions.

"Section 9. No child under thirteen years of age shall be employed or allowed to work by any person, company, firm, or corporation at labor or service in any shop, factory, mine, store, place of manufacture, business, or amusement, except as hereinafter provided."

Sections 10, 11, 12, and 13 provide for the execution and proper administration of section 9.

Such is the law. Its supporters argue that it is purely American in its tendencies; that, English being the language of the country, every child should be compelled to acquire a knowledge of it before he comes to the age of fourteen; that it will tend to do away with the clannishness of our foreign element and Americanize our foreigners. They point to the fact that, in this the metropolis of the State, the proceedings of the Common Council and Board of Supervisors, and the legal notices, have to be published both in German and in English. They deny that the law is in any way aimed against the Germans or against the German language, and call attention to the fact that the Turners have declared in favor of the act.

It is impossible within the limits of this communication to detail the numerous arguments urged against the law. It is said that the power given to the boards of education is too autocratic, that the fines are onerous in the extreme, that the provision confining the education of the children to the district wherein they reside is restrictive and unjust, etc., etc. The opponents of the law do not object to compulsory education—indeed, we have had compulsory education in this State since 1879; but they object to being compelled to educate their children in a certain *way*. The opposition to this law may be summarized as follows:

(1.) The Roman Catholic Church objects to it as the entering wedge against, and a covert attack upon, their parochial-school system, which is supported by voluntary contribution. They have submitted to the mill tax for general education, they support the public schools, they support their own parochial schools too, wherein they allege that English is taught fully within the requirements of the law. They protest against their parochial schools being placed under the supervision of the State. They claim that it interferes with the rights of the parent.

(2.) The Lutherans object to the law because it will destroy many of their parochial schools, wherein lack of funds makes it impossible to keep a corps of English teachers, and because it transfers to the State the rights and duties of the parent. The Lutheran does not object to the compulsory teaching of reading and writing in English, but he does to arithmetic and history, on the ground that it is unnecessary, because the struggle of the German parent is to keep the child to a knowledge of his mother tongue, and he acquires English anyway.

(3.) The religious press, for obvious reasons, support their parochial schools.

The underlying feeling through all this is that the law is paternal legislation, undemocratic and unrepublican. And this last objection is not confined to dogmatic lines, but it is the main objection which tends to unite the foreign-born element against the law.

In the meantime an immense amount of "trimming" is being done. The State press is filled with personal opinions on the merits or demerits of the law. The press itself is badly at loggerheads. The *Sentinel* has steadfastly supported the Governor and the law; the *Evening Wisconsin*, the leading Republican evening paper, is equally opposed to the law, and makes it the basis of a vigorous attack upon Gov. Hoard. *Der Herold*, the most important non-sectarian German Republican daily in the State, while professing not to oppose the principles of the measure, demands amendments, and condemns the Governor for having approved it. The *Germania* and the *Seebote*, respectively the organs of the Lutherans and the Catholics, oppose the law for the reasons before mentioned. Small-bore politicians are trying to trim their sails to the rapidly shifting winds, hoping to derive some personal advantage out of the general disturbance.

The Republicans may be able to patch up a peace before the general elections in the fall, but, at the present writing, political graves are yawning on every side, and were a general election held to-day, Wisconsin would be a "doubtful" State of the most approved uncertainty.

BRADLEY G. SCHLEY.

MILWAUKEE, March 15, 1890.

INSTRUCTION IN GERMAN AND IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: From Prof. Francke's letter to the *Nation* of February 13, one not acquainted with the facts would get some mistaken ideas as to the matter treated of. Though the writer takes pains to designate work done in German universities as "general" and "special," and that done in American universities as "elementary" and "advanced," the impression made throughout is that our elementary corresponds to their general, and our advanced to their special. Of course such an idea is not to be entertained. The *ordentlicher* professor is responsible for his department, and is anxious that the fundamental and most important subjects in his branch be regularly taught. Under the German system, or lack of system, the professor in charge of a department cannot direct that any of this work be done by the *ausserordentlicher* professor or by a *Privatdocent*, and consequently he must do it himself. Still, in most cases he prefers to do so, for he desires to give the stamp to the instruction of the institution he represents. The courses we have in mind are encyclopædic rather than compendious, occupying four or five hours a week, and are by no means to be confounded with elementary work.

Still, though a professor cannot tell a *Privatdocent* what to teach, he can, practically, tell him what not to. It is common in this country to picture the bright young German *Privatdocent* as lecturing on the same subject as the professor, and drawing a full house, to the great discomfiture of his antiquated superior. Nothing could be more false. A *Privatdocent* knows well enough that it would be very poor policy on his part to openly set up a rivalry with the professor. He almost always carefully avoids the courses the latter is in the habit of reading, and is consequently, for the most part, restricted to special courses. If he does lecture on the professor's favorite subjects, he takes pains to do so some other semester. Years ago a now famous German professor was *Privatdocent* at one of the larger universities, and had announced a course of lectures for the following semester. But before the semester opened, a new *ausserordentlicher* professor was appointed, who wished to make his début with a course on the same subject. At his request the *ordentlicher* professor asked the *Privatdocent* not to lecture on that subject. As the latter had already made his announcement, he declined to yield to the request, and a struggle ensued, which ultimately resulted in his favor; but his persistence brought upon him the lasting hostility of not only the *ordentlicher* and the *ausserordentliche* professors, but also the whole "school" to which they belong—a hostility that makes itself felt whenever his name is proposed for a better position than the one he now holds.

Moreover, it is by no means generally true that the full professor does comparatively little special work, and that what there is of elementary work is mostly done by him. There are at least three considerations that invalidate Prof. Francke's calculations.

In the first place, the most truly special work is done in the seminary; a course of lectures on some division of a subject surely cannot be supposed "to train investigators" in anything like the way a course of work in a seminary does. With what feelings would Prof. Zupitza at Berlin look upon the most special of all special work, that done semester after semester in his English seminary, should he be informed that "it is universally felt . . . that the *Privatdocenten* . . . are best fitted to reach out into new fields and to train investigators"! But Prof. Francke does not take the work done in seminaries into account at all; he says, "As every university teacher without exception conducts a seminar, or a course corresponding to it, this element also was omitted from the comparison." This is about as logical as it would be to reason as follows: "I want to find out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what is the proportion between the cultivated land on A's farm and that on B's. A has less acres in corn than B, but they both have sown the same number of acres of wheat. As the wheat is equal in both, we may neglect that, and the proportion of A's corn to B's corn will be the proportion of A's cultivated land to B's cultivated land."

Secondly, to "select the two largest German universities as specimens to illustrate what is a general tendency of German university education," is surely a strange proceeding. Would one select London and New York as specimens to illustrate what is a general tendency of life in cities large and small? To say nothing of other considerations, the number of *Privatdocenten* that crowd these universities,* and are forced, in order to get auditors, to offer something novel or a specialty not offered by another—this alone is sufficient to make figures obtained there not true of the average university. It is not my intention to attempt such a classification of work done at other universities as Prof. Francke has of that at Berlin and Munich; but I would give as a fairer sample the work done in the German department at Göttingen during the semester I spent there some years ago.

Prof. ordinarius Müller:
(1.) Hist. Gram. der deutschen Sprache, fünf Stunden.
(2.) Seminar: Hartmanns "Iwein."

Prof. ordinarius Heyne:
(1.) Deutsche Wortbildungslehre, drei Stunden.
(2.) Lessing und seine Zeit, zwei Stunden.
(3.) Seminar: "Kunst Küstner" (an attempt to establish the origin of the text).

Prof. extraordinarius Goedeke:
Über Goethes Leben und Schriften, eine Stunde.

Prof. extraordinarius Bechtel:
Über althochdeutsche Dialekte, eine Stunde.

Privatdocent Roethe:
(1.) Gesch. der deut. Lit. (1200–1500), drei Stunden.
(2.) Erklärung Goethischer Gedichte, eine Stunde.
(3.) Deutsche Übungen für Anfänger (gotisch und althochdeutsch), zwei Stunden.

Here we have general work, special work, and elementary work. Whether Prof. Francke would classify it as I should, I do not know. Only two of the courses seem to me to be "general": the five-hour course in Germanic grammar by Prof. Müller, and Privatdocent Roethe's three-hour course, treating of the first three centuries of German literature (the course was carried down to recent times in the following semesters). The other courses offered by the professors I should class as special. All the elementary work done was done by the *Privatdocent*.

Thirdly, Prof. Francke seems to forget that it is not the *Privatdocent* that corresponds to our instructor, but the *Lector* (and in some scientific work the *Assistent*). Perhaps the oversight was due to the fact that the name and work of the *Lector* are not always published in the catalogue, which is usually the case when the University does not appoint the *Lector* directly, but through the professor. As the Gymnasium course is longer than that of our high schools, there is less elementary work done in the University, and, therefore, the sphere of the *Lector* is limited, and sometimes (as in the case of instruction in the mother tongue) wanting. But the *Lector* is engaged at a salary, as is the American instructor, and does all the elementary work that somebody else does not care to do—and so does the American instructor. That the latter may, in time, rise to a professorship, while a German *Lector* seldom does, is rather an advantage inherent in the American position.

But the burden of Prof. Francke's letter seems to be the desirability of the introduction of the *Privatdocent* system into our universities. If this means the granting to young men of ability who can live without a salary the privilege of lecturing or conducting other courses, and thus an opportunity to show their fitness to occupy a higher position, and does not mean that this is to be the only way open to aspirants (for I need hardly mention that most German *Privatdocenten* nearly starve before they get a professorship or throw the thing up), I do not see that any one can find fault with it; indeed, much would, without question, be gained, and a start of the kind seems to have been made at Clark University. But if it practically means that instructors engaged at a salary are to conduct most of the courses in special or advanced work, not even "encumbered with conducting examinations," while the bulk of the elementary work is to be assigned to the professors, as "through wider experience and practical efficiency best adapted to represent the foundations and the system of their science in their accepted form," why, we should all want to stay instructors.

GEORGE HEMPL.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, March 4, 1890.

* I have by me only the *Universitätskalender* for the winter of '85–'86. According to this, there were in active service in the "Philosophische Fakultät" 37 *ordentliche* professors at Berlin, 28 at Munich, 17 at Jena, and 32 at Göttingen; 44 *Privatdocenten* at Berlin, 30 at Munich, 9 at Jena, 15 at Göttingen. The per cent. of *Privatdocenten* to *ordentliche* professors was thus at Berlin 118, at Munich 107, while at Jena only 52 and at Göttingen 46. As the universities at Berlin and Munich have since grown very rapidly the proportion is now even greater.

WHEAT-RAISING IN NEW ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Familiar, long ago, as a New England boy, with rye bread, I agree with Chisholm that "in a large part of that region, wheaten bread did not early come into general use." I hold that your reviewer of Chisholm (No. 1286) would not have controverted Chisholm's statement if he had not himself forgotten a notable passage in Dwight's 'Travels'—the best description of New England some ten decades ago. In 1796 Dr. Dwight made a journey on horseback from New Haven to Maine. His ride was leisurely, and his notes, in their exactitude, often recall the incomparable Samuel Pepys. He declares that "the country lying eastward of a line which may be fixed about thirty miles east of Connecticut River, is unfavorable to the production of wheat. The cause," he says, "I have in vain attempted to investigate." He talks about several assigned causes, in which he has no faith, as soil, ocean, fertilizers, and the barberry bush, and adds, "Whatever may be the cause, the effect is certain."

"A traveller will scarcely see a field of wheat in this tract during a journey of one hundred miles. The general opinion of the farmers is that wheat cannot here be cultivated with success. . . . In consequence of this fact, the bread generally used in this region is made of rye. Rye bread is used in considerable quantities on Connecticut River [that is, in a district where wheat would grow]. A stranger can hardly be persuaded that this bread is preferred by the inhabitants who have been used to it to the best wheaten loaf" ('Travels,' i., p. 376.)

It was those who did not prefer it who migrated to the Connecticut valley and filled its intervales with wheat fields, and so westward to the Connecticut Reserve, raising crops there to fill the boats on the Erie Canal. Their motto was that of Gen. Sherman's Old Shady, "We're going up North, or out West, where they eat *white bread* and get a dollar a day."

B.

[We are grateful to our correspondent for calling our attention to this interesting passage in Dwight's 'Travels,' but we doubt whether it wholly supports the idea which Mr. Chisholm's words would convey to the average reader. All that can be certainly deduced from Dr. Dwight's testimony is that in 1796 rye bread was generally used in the eastern half of Massachusetts. If we turn back to p. 373, we see that his remarks on the pages immediately following are a general comment on Worcester County. In the paragraph following that quoted by our correspondent, he says: "The white bread served up at the tables in this county, and in the country further east, particularly in the inns, is made in the form of large biscuits, dry and hard, but agreeable to the taste." Dr. Dwight also tells us he has seen rye bread on the most richly spread tables in Boston, "preferred both by the host and the guests to the finest white bread."

We will note, very briefly, some of Dr. Dwight's other statements on wheat-growing. Vol. i, p. 48, wheat grows well west of the White Mountains, "and in very many places eastward of that limit"; p. 108, the average crop of wheat in Connecticut, fifteen bushels to the acre; p. 195, wheat flour in New Haven market $6 to $9 a barrel in 1810, lower in 1820; vol. ii, p. 110, northern New Hampshire—the land yields wheat and other grains in abundance; "wheat yields ordinarily from twenty to thirty bushels an acre." The average yield of wheat over the whole country is to-day about twelve and a-half bushels per acre. On p. 340 is a discussion "why the lands in New England which formerly yielded wheat surely and plentifully," now suffer from the blast. On p. 342 he says: "All the lands in this country which were not too wet, originally yielded wheat easily, surely, and, so far as they were rich, abundantly." "This country" would seem to mean New England, from the context.

As regards eastern Massachusetts, in vol. iii., p. 75, we find that in Sandwich wheat "not uncommonly yields well"; in vol. iv., p. 159, Dr. Dwight notes that for a hundred years it has been a popular belief that wheat could not come to perfection in eastern Massachusetts; but Mr. Bartlett of Methuen (Essex County) deserved the credit of having shown that "this gray-haired prejudice" was "without foundation." The "Father of American Geography," in his descriptions of the different New England States (Morse's Geography, *passim*), would lead one to suppose that, with the exception of eastern Massachusetts, New England could easily grow enough wheat for the home demand. The export of wheat flour from Boston would seem to indicate that some of the consumption of rye must have been for some other reason than the lack of wheat flour.

If we are correct in interpreting the pas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sages our correspondent quotes from Dr. Dwight as applying primarily to Worcester County, it is obvious that the Erie Canal could have afforded little relief to the situation before the completion of either the Boston and Worcester Railroad in 1835, or of the Western Railroad (B. & A.) in 1841. Upon further reflection, we incline to attribute the increased use of wheat in New England rather to general economic improvement than to any specific cause like the Erie Canal, for the cultivation of Western lands and the modern transportation system have reduced the price of corn and rye far more than of wheat. In 1810 a barrel of flour cost about the same as eight bushels of corn or rye, while to-day a barrel of flour costs about the same as fifteen bushels of corn and twelve bushels of rye.—Ed. Nation.]

THE FARM VILLA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have been much attracted by your article suggesting to city people buying up deserted farms for vacation residences. I see, however, many reasons which will prevent any rush of applications for them. First, there is but little taste among our young people for a quiet life. They demand excitement; they like to take their country pleasures in company with many of their mates. A summer without tennis parties, riding parties, boating parties, would be no fun at all. Many of them do not have very lively winters. They look forward to the life in summer hotels to make up for it. In reading stories of English country life among the gentry who do not go to London, I fancy almost every American girl feels that such a slow, uneventful existence would be impossible to her. But if mothers with young families would take their children year by year to these quiet places, no doubt a taste for simple country pleasures and fine scenery might be developed.

Then comes in another set of difficulties. Very few husbands and fathers can leave their business to stay with their families. A young mother in an isolated farm-house, without her husband, is in a very lonely position, not to speak of the real danger from tramps, which would haunt her nights and banish sleep. The difficulty of getting servants to stay in such places would prevent her filling her house with friends, even should her purse allow such hospitality (and we are considering the needs of those who must find an inexpensive way of taking a vacation). And so, though when I first read your article I felt I must immediately begin to save up the $500 for that farm under Chicorua, further reflection has dampened my ardor.

But, as I write, a new idea flashes into my mind. Why could not two families of friends combine in one farm-house, or two neighboring farms, and thus find society and mutual protection, in addition to the other charms which you put forward so attractively?

Hausmutter.

Salem, Mass., March 8, 1890.

THE SPOILSMAN AND HIS PICTURE GALLERY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In a recent letter from Washington, the correspondent of the Boston *Herald* (March 10) endeavors to show that a great injustice is done to some of our high officials by political attacks and caricatures. He gives instances of strangers to the capital who had conceived that certain statesmen were little better than demons with forked tails, but who have returned from a visit thither full of admiration and wonder at the virtues and attractions of the accused. Then he draws two or three charming pictures of the "homes" of politicians. We learn that one Cabinet officer is a highly moral, cultivated, and refined man, with taste in art, and that his first assistant has a pleasant domestic circle and a fine picture gallery. It is called little less than an outrage that such persons should be the butt of political satire and contumely.

The correspondent does not reflect that the more virtuous and refined a man may be, so much the more shameful to him are acts which might be expected from immorality of character or unenlightened Philistinism. What consolation is it to the people that their officials can appreciate masterpieces of Corot, though not the worth of a long-tried and honest public servant? "The fact of their possession alone (*sic*) showed the nature of their owner," says the correspondent. What must be thought of him who loves truth in art, but clings to a policy exactly opposed to promises made before election to office? What of him whose domestic life is pure and undefiled, but whose public acts are stained with offences against political morality? Nothing for such an one but to cry, like the weakling that he is,

"Video meliora proboque:
Deteriora sequor."

Nothing but a blunted moral sense or the ingenuity of perversity can discover in fine personal qualities excuse for public wrong-doing.

M. H. M.

Cambridge, March 12.

MR. BISHOP'S SPANISH ARTICLE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I was not at all surprised to hear that Spanish women wrote, but I am surprised that your paragrapher should have read my article carelessly before commenting upon it. (The article is that on "Literary Madrid" in the February *Scribner's*, mentioned in the *Nation* of February 6.) I referred to the gallant saying that Spanish women do not write nor read many books, because they are satisfied with their influence in inspiring them. I have told the story before in the *Nation*, and it was a Spaniard who said it. Thereupon, I said, a few lines later, that Emilia Pardo Bazán was *one* Spanish woman at least who wrote, and that exceedingly well, meaning the emphasis to be got by connection with the former statement. I do not think this slight attempt at a jocose turn ought to be so misleading as to make it appear that I supposed there was absolutely only one Spanish woman in existence who wrote.

I am further taken to task for mentioning as "last" works two that were in actual fact the last at the time of my visit to Madrid, *i. e.*, in the spring of 1889. Naturally enough there has been opportunity for others to appear between that time and the moment of your critic's sending his "copy" to the press. As to Galdós's "first" book, I should have done better to say that 'Doña Perfecta' was his first pronounced and high-grade success, or, perhaps, the first of the novels proper, for a pronounced distinction is made between the novels and the 'Episodios Nacionales,' and the publishers in their list put 'La Fontana de Oro,' dealing with the events between 1820 and 1823, in a department by itself, much nearer the latter than the former.

And now, as to the matter of putting words together, it seems as if your paragrapher had been at some pains to frame his in such a way as to let it be implied that I had derived some important advantage of information about Galdós from the little Spanish pamphlet in the 'Celebridades Contemporáneas' series, instead of getting it from him personally. I do not care very much about this, but it gives me the opportunity to add, if you are willing, still another curious trait of Galdós, in virtue of which trait it will be seen, too, that it would have been absolutely impossible to get information about him from the pamphlet in question. Indeed, this little brochure is worthy of a place in a museum, as probably containing less on its subject, in proportion to its size, than any similar publication ever put forth. I happened upon it, I think, in the railway station just as I was leaving Madrid.

Its author, Leopoldo Alas, "Clarin," prides himself upon being one of those journalists who most enjoy Galdós's intimacy and confidence out of all Spain. This he says himself. "But what veritable labors it cost me," he exclaims, "to draw out of him the bare admission that he was born at Las Palmas." It seems that it is one of the most marked peculiarities of Benito Pérez Galdós not to want to tell anything about himself.

"He has a history," says Clarin, "yes, he has one, but he keeps it under lock and key. Having set out to prepare this series of biographical notices," he goes on, "and anxious to make the first one as taking as possible, I availed myself of my friendship with Galdós, and begged of him the data necessary for his case. After a long and most amiable correspondence, it appeared that he did not know in any determinate way what that kind of data was, or what was demanded of him. In any case, as the upshot of it all, it was duly admitted and agreed that he was, in fact, born at Las Palmas. If I exaggerate a little, it is very little indeed, as the reader who has curiosity enough will see in the end."

This, in truth—and I think I begin to admire the model for its refreshing rarity—is all that the reader does find in the whole closely printed thirty-nine pages.

To this same spirit I fear it was due that Galdós did not send his photograph over to America, as I had every reason to believe he would do, and that the photo-lithographed portrait and facsimile page from the 'Celebridades Contemporáneas' came to be used at the last moment as illustrations. Galdós knew of the possible use of that portrait, in default of one more satisfactory to himself.

William Henry Bishop.

Villefranche, Alpes Maritimes, Feb. 23, 1890.

PROTESTANTISM AND LOTTERIES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The New York *Times* of March 10, in an editorial on the establishment of a State lottery in North Dakota, says:

"The public sentiment about lotteries is very largely a matter of geography, or, at least, of race. In Protestant and Anglo-Saxon countries lotteries are looked upon as devices of Satan."

Now, Prussia is a Protestant country, yet in all its principal cities a handsome office on the ground floor of an important street bears across its plate-glass windows, in letters to attract the passer-by, "Royal Lottery." The institution is not "dedicated by permission" to royalty, but is under Government management. The old Emperor William is said to have been opposed to its continuance, yet he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nevertheless found its abolishment not advisable.

The newspapers publish advertisements of various private lotteries for every conceivable object, such as repairing a cathedral, etc., and benevolent ladies organize a lottery among their friends as they here get up a concert. In German novels a poor but worthy man is often started on an upward career by winning a lottery prize. While in Germany, I came across a magazine article which, urging the wisdom of keeping a systematic account of the family outlay ranged in appropriate columns, included under its headings of personal expenses lottery tickets; and although the author wrote in the interests of economy, he said not a word about eliminating that column.

An old gentleman asked if we had lotteries in America, and I thought I was to be taunted with the Louisiana one, but found myself mistaken. "Ah, only one! We manage things much better in this country. Here, Government establishes a lottery in all the towns, thus giving every poor man a chance to grow rich"; and a look of serene superiority appeared on the faces of my German convives. I never found it possible to make my German acquaintances understand the Anglo-Saxon feeling towards lotteries, and if the German element preponderates in the population of Dakota, I should think the passage of the obnoxious bill highly probable. There would be nothing incongruous in the existence of a lottery in a State whose capital is Bismarck. J. C. N.

CINCINNATI.

Notes.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS have in press 'The Poetry of the Anti-Jacobin,' edited by Charles Edmunds, with Gillray's designs—a limited edition; 'The Trials of a Country Parson,' by Augustus Jessopp; 'The Sayings of Poor Richard,' being Franklin's prefaces, proverbs, and poems extracted from his almanac (1733 1758), by Paul Leicester Ford; 'American Farms, their Condition and Future,' by J. R. Elliott; 'The Story of Russia,' by W. R. Morfill, and 'The Story of the Jews under Rome,' by W. Douglas Morrison, in the "Story of the Nations" series. They also announce a new series, edited by Evelyn Abbott, to be called "Heroes of the Nations," dealing with "historical characters about whom have gathered national traditions, and who have been accepted as types of the several national ideas," as Nelson, Gustavus Adolphus, Pericles, etc.

John Wiley & Sons have in preparation a 'Handbook of Problems in Direct Fire,' by Capt. James M. Ingalls, First United States Artillery; and 'Constructive Steam Engineering,' by Prof. Jay M. Whitham.

Henry Holt & Co. will shortly publish an 'Introduction to Systematic Botany,' by Prof. Charles E. Bessey of the University of Nebraska; and 'The Idle Thoughts of an Idle Fellow,' by Jerome K. Jerome.

'The Future of Science,' by Ernest Renan, will be produced in English in May by Roberts Bros., Boston.

The third volume of the 'Sketches of War History,' issued under the auspices of the Loyal Legion of the United States (Ohio Commandery), is about to appear, with the imprint of Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati. Twenty-two papers are enumerated, mostly on operations in the Southwestern field, but there are also papers on the critical engagements of the Army of the Potomac, and diplomacy and the navy are not neglected.

We have received from Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, a complete English version of the 'Journal of Marie Bashkirtseff,' in which passages omitted or condensed in other translations have been restored. The only effect is to give the reader more of the wearisome repetition of this selfish victim of her own vanity, and to draw out more tediously a disagreeable tale.

The issue of the "Knickerbocker Nuggets" which is entitled 'The Garden' (G. P. Putnam's Sons), gathers those pieces upon the subject, by Bacon, Temple, Addison, Pope, Goldsmith, Walpole, and others, which have become classical, and makes a brief and delightful history of the English taste in gardening. An introduction, admirably done, is furnished by Mr. Walter Howe, and passages from the two Plinys agreeably open the volume. The conception of the work was happy, and the result is a charming book of out-of-the-way literature very welcome to a refined taste.

The extent to which Spenser was much more than a story-teller is illustrated by a little volume of 'Tales from Spenser' (Macmillan), on the well-known model of such popularization of the narrative element in literature. Only a comparatively small portion of his poetical fables is dealt with, and the result is as excellent as the nature of the case permits; but the interest is slight, the adventures seem very shadowy, and perhaps the best use the book can be put to is to point the moral of how little, after all, Spenser owed to his poetical "machinery."

Mr. William Davenport Adams, encouraged by the reception of his 'By-Ways in Bookland,' publishes a second series of these slight essays under the title of 'Rambles in Bookland' (A. C. Armstrong & Son), of the same agreeable but trifling quality. The topics are such as allow of liberal quotation and abundant literary anecdote, but are not so fresh or varied as in the previous volume. The papers, however, are meant only to while away a moment of idleness, and they attain their unambitious end with commendable lightness of touch.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. have brought out a new edition (the third) of Prof. R. T. Ely's 'Labor Movement in America.' It is unchanged, except for an appendix on the relations of the temperance agitation to the labor movement, a very characteristic piece of writing. "I think," he says, "that absolutely temperate strikers, fleeing all associations with saloons, opening every meeting of any sort with prayer, and holding a prayer-meeting, or some kind of religious service, every day, would inspire an unscrupulous individual or corporate employer with a new terror."

A stout volume, the report of the Commission on Industrial Education made to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, comes to us from Harrisburg. As a repository of facts bearing on the subject it appears deserving of attention, and a large edition has been ordered by the Legislature. Very little has been done as yet by the States to foster industrial education. The Commission cite statutes only of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

The Channing Club of Boston, of which the Secretary is Mr. George Peirce, No. 70 Water Street, has a Committee which reports annually upon the books for boys published during the year. Such as it approves it makes a classified and descriptive list of, and that for 1888 is now before us, and is procurable of the Secretary for a postage stamp. Every title has a brief comment attached. We remark that most of them are as well fitted for girls as for boys, and that not a few were composed and issued with a view to adult reading—for example, Prof. Masson's 'Story of Mediæval France,' and Tolstoi's 'The Long Exile.'

We are glad to see a second edition, enlarged, of Prof. B. G. Wilder's wholesome 'Health Notes for Students,' a volume for the side-pocket (G. P. Putnam's Sons). Among the "Aphorisms" at the beginning, we find this from Prof. Goldwin Smith, which has a cis-Atlantic validity: "The mania for athletics in England seemed to me to have perverted, so far as a good many of the students were concerned, the objects of the University, set up a totally false standard of excellence, and almost misdirected the aim of life."

A translation of the Swiss Constitution, by Prof. Albert B. Hart of Harvard College, has been added by D. C. Heath & Co. to their "Old South Leaflets." Other European constitutions will follow, and some representative American, like that of Ohio, which has already been printed in the above series.

In a rather untidy pamphlet, with rough and quite needless sketches by M. Gorguet, a French musician who calls himself "Benedictus" has collected the strange native airs performed in Paris during the Exhibition of last summer. Among the exotic tunes written out in 'Les Musiques Bizarres à l'Exposition' (Paris: Hartmann; New York: F. W. Christern), are airs of Javanese, Japanese, Algerian, Annamite, Persian, and Rumanian origin. There are a dozen in all, of which perhaps the most curious is the famous "Danse du Ventre."

M. Auguste Vitu continues the steady collection of his theatrical criticisms from the *Figaro*, and the latest volume of 'Les Mille et Une Nuits au Théâtre' is the seventh (Paris: Ollendorff; New York: F. W. Christern). It extends from January, 1879, to March, 1880, and the most important play criticised is "Daniel Rochat." There is an interesting and learned excursus about the origin of "Ruy Blas"; M. Vitu does not seem to have discovered the likeness of the fundamental situation of Hugo's play to that on which the "Lady of Lyons" is based. A glance through his pages shows that the present sterility of the French drama had begun ten years ago: revivals and dramatizations of novels were almost as frequent then as now.

M. Jules Claretie, a dramatist himself, and now the director of the Comédie-Française, contributes a pleasant preface to a little collection of puppet-plays, 'Le Guignol des Champs-Élysées,' by MM. Adolphe Tavernier and Arsène Alexandre (Paris: Delagrave; New York: F. W. Christern). The ten tiny dramas herein contained are adapted for performance by puppets like those familiar to us in Punch-and-Judy shows and animated by the human thumb and fingers—a form of puppet capable of far more humorous acting than the marionette manipulated by wires from above. The French Punch-and-Judy show is not confined to one monotonous drama; it has a varied repertory, sometimes calling for two operators, that four figures may appear at once. The plays in the present volume are a little literary and less pantomimic than those actually acted in the best of the *guignols* in the Champs-Élysées; but they may be recommended to the American juvenile amateur. The illustrations have one fatal defect: they are illustrations of the plot as literature; they are not illustrations of puppets in a puppet-show, as were the unequalled sketches in which George Cruikshank once explained the British Punch-and-Judy.

The third volume of the *Forschungen zur Deutschen Landes- und Volkskunde*, edited by Prof. Dr. A. Kirchhoff of Halle, is lately issued. It contains essays by Borggreve, on the dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tribution and value of the more important trees of Germany; by Jäschke, on the Meissnerland between the lowlands of the Werra and the Fulda; by Burgkhardt, on the Erzgebirge in their anthropological relations; by Bezzenberger, on the Kurish lowland and its inhabitants; and by Krones, on the German settlements in the Eastern Alps. The essays are all of serious and thorough character, but are not well provided with maps, diagrams, and views. Dr. Kirchhoff is also editor and in part author of *Länderkunde des Erdtheils Europa*, in which several competent geographers coöperate with him. Several finely illustrated parts have appeared. The work appeals to a highly intelligent circle of readers.

Prof. Georg Gizycki of the University of Berlin has translated, with the author's permission and revision, five ethical discourses by William M. Salter: 'Moralische Reden' (Leipzig: W. Friedrich).

A new sixteen-page periodical will be launched directly in Boston, by Benjamin R. Tucker, called *Five Stories a Week*. The stories will be short and from writers of all countries.

Garden and Forest for March 12 contains a notable bibliography of landscape-gardening in English, French, German, and Italian, by Henry Sargent Codman of Brookline, Mass. It has been prepared with the aid of the library of the British Museum, the National Library in Paris, and of other public and private libraries, and fills nearly five pages of *Garden and Forest*. It begins with Bacon's essay "Of Gardens," 1625. The second work is French, 1638. Milton's 'Paradise Lost,' Book iv., 1667, stands fourth on the list. Walpole has several entries. Rousseau contributes from the 'Nouvelle Héloïse.' Loudon cuts a great figure; Downing likewise, from 1841 on. Other American names than the latter pioneer's are H. W. S. Cleveland, Wilson Flagg, F. L. Olmsted, R. M. Copeland, Charles Follen (the younger), Donald G. Mitchell, etc. The list merits separate publication, and perhaps will get it after the present issue of it has served its purpose as a proof-sheet.

From last year's *American Field* Dr. R. W. Shufeldt has reprinted in a brochure a series of popular articles, 'Remarks upon Extinct Mammals,' with illustrations of the skeleton and some restorations from the author's own pencil. They make a convenient grouping.

Profs. W. B. Scott and Henry F. Osborn of Princeton have reprinted from the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society their memoir, 'The Mammalia of the Uinta Formation,' descriptive principally of a collection made by the Princeton Scientific Expedition of 1886 in the Bad Lands of the White River, northeastern Utah. Prof. Scott leads with an exhibition of the geological and faunal relations of the Uinta Eocene formation, in comparison with the Bridger and White River basins particularly. Prof. Osborn reports utter confusion in the nomenclature, both foreign and American, of the Eocene Perissodactyla, which include the interesting series of the many-toed horses. Five full-page lithographic plates accompany the text.

Mr. A. F. Bandelier has been publishing in the New York *Belletristisches Journal* since the new year a serial story, "Die Kô-Sha-Re," illustrative of the life of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. The rôle of novelist is somewhat new for this scholar, but it cannot be said that he is going beyond his last. In fact, no one is so competent as he to attempt this portrayal. The *Journal* has just entered its thirty-ninth volume, under the editorship of Dr. Julius Goebel. Its range is wide, from politics to music, literature, and current events. The form of the paper is inconveniently large, judged by American standards, and in the finer type the Gothic letter becomes sufficiently trying.

Anglia, entering upon its thirteenth volume, loses the editorship of Prof. Wülker, leaving Dr. Ewald Flügel in sole charge. To the quarterly issue it is intended to add a monthly critical paper having special reference to American literature, and the first number will appear about April 1. This review department should not be overlooked by American publishers whom *Anglia* is capable of serving. The magazine is issued at Leipzig.

Armenia is the subject of a valuable paper in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for March, by Col. M. S. Bell. In the course of an account of a journey through that country he points out the most available railway routes by which it may eventually be connected with the Mediterranean and Black Sea. His observations also led him to believe that Russia, which was then completing military roads from the Caucasus to the Turkish frontier, could easily occupy Armenia in three weeks, and that her ultimate approach to Constantinople may not impossibly be from this direction. The Turkish army which was being collected to oppose this advance, he characterizes as "little better than a military mob." He adds, in words confirming somewhat similar impressions of Mr. Curzon in Khorassan, that the humanity shown by Russia to her prisoners of war has made a lasting impression upon the Turkish soldiers, many of whom, in consequence, "expressed themselves as ready to be made prisoners of war rather than to fight" under their present conditions. While censuring the British indifference to the sufferings of the Armenians, notwithstanding the treaty obligations of the Government to see that certain reforms were carried out, he pays the highest tribute of praise to the American missionaries, who, by their educational and religious work and by their "exemplary and honorable lives, [are] introducing the elements of a higher civilization among both Turks and Armenians." Mr. J. Abercromby describes the once famous "Wall of Derbend," which stretches from the Caspian westward some twenty-five miles. Tradition attributes its construction to Alexander the Great, and says that it formerly extended to the Black Sea. The best authorities, however, believe it to have been built in the sixth century by Khosroes I., a contemporary of Justinian, "with the object of checking the incursions into Persian territory of the Khazars from the north."

— A writer in the March *Macmillan's* discusses the matter of the choice of titles for novels with a good deal of interesting literary detail. Authors differ very much in this faculty of naming their offspring, though the fortune of a book is often materially affected by their happiness in the selection. Some choose the title first, as Gautier, who announced 'Le Capitaine Fracasse' thirty years before composing the story; Dickens, too, was ill at ease and could not go on smoothly with his tale until the title was ready, though he sometimes changed it at the end. On the other hand, readers of Wilkie Collins will remember how hard he strove for the title of 'The Woman in White' after the novel was completed. Historically the hero first gave the name, as in 'Tom Jones'; then sprang up the name of the locality, as in 'The Castle of Otranto' and its numerous brood, down to the most successful of such titles, Victor Hugo's 'Notre Dame.' Historical novels of the best sort, the writer observes, do not take names from the period or the great personages: we find rather 'Quentin Durward' and 'The Three Musketeers' as typical successes in this department. 'Kenilworth' was Constable's title, which is less good than 'Cumnor Hall,' but to Constable we owe 'Rob Roy' and 'Redgauntlet,' two of the best of Scott's always happy names. The proverb form, 'Red as a Rose Is She,' and the interrogative form, 'What Will He Do with It?' are very properly set down as poor, being unsatisfactory and plainly sensational. The best title is that which does not disclose the story or reveal its leading character or topic, but suggests a real invention; among the most excellent, for example, are 'The Scarlet Letter' and 'Wuthering Heights.' In plays a different rule would seem to hold, possibly because Shakspere's greatest plays are called by the hero's name. Titles for long poems are, perhaps, the most difficult of all, and the failure of modern epics has been foreshadowed by the dismal failure of their names. 'The Idylls of the King' is good, but it is an evasion of a title, in fact.

—A recent instance of library cataloguing is worthy of notice from several points of view. This is the 'Alphabetic Catalogue of the English books in the Circulating Department of the Cleveland (Ohio) Public Library,' a quarto of some 1,400 pages. A less cumbersome title for the work might have been preferred, certainly, as a matter of taste, yet an examination of the limitations observed in its construction vindicates its truthfulness. The successive developments in library administration and coöperation from year to year are not without their influence upon the prevailing types of library catalogues. Thus the great catalogues of Mr. Cutter and Mr. Noyes, begun as they were before the completion of Poole's Index, and giving exceptional space to analyzing the contents of volumes of essays, periodicals, etc., are of extraordinary service. Yet no catalogue now would index the contents of periodicals at so great length, and thus duplicate the work of Poole's Index. The size, moreover, of a library has some important bearing on the type of catalogue to be chosen, as have also the character and comparative rarity or commonness of the books composing it. Taking all the conditions into account, Mr. Brett, in deciding on the details of a catalogue for this library of 58,000 volumes (about 54,000 when the printing was begun), appears to have chosen wisely. A catalogue of the Reference Department had already been made, in 1883, on the alphabetico-classed plan of the Brooklyn Library. In this one, however, the dictionary catalogue is adopted as the type (author, title, and subject in one alphabet); the classification is that of the Dewey system; and the catalogue entries are made on the basis of Cutter's Rules. Several attempts have been made within the past few years to fix upon a standard size of page for a library catalogue. This is a question which, if any proper proportion be observed, holds a very intimate relation to the other question of the size of the library and the consequent number of pages required. Mr. Brett's page is undeniably large, though certainly not too large if the thickness of the book be considered; yet we can but think that he would have modified his plan to advantage, particularly when the future policy of the library as to catalogues is considered, if he had been willing to forego the entry of contents of books in so many instances. No one can doubt the serviceableness of this kind of information; and yet the question of unnecessary duplication has become a practical one here, as in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

case of the periodicals included in Poole's Index. It is possible, of course, to discriminate in this matter. Thus, it is hardly worth while, in each one of the many library catalogues all over the country, of which this may properly be taken as a type, to devote more than two columns to minutely enumerating the contents of Daniel Webster's works, when each library may number among its works of reference the Brooklyn Catalogue, which has done this at length. On the other hand, the similar analysis made in the case of Tolstoi's works serves a really useful purpose, since not so obviously accessible elsewhere.

—*Le Droit d'Auteur*, the official organ of the Bureau of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, has completed its second year. The treaty for the creation of this important Union was signed at Berne, Switzerland, September 9, 1886, and went into force on December 5, 1887. Its sixteenth article provided for the organization of an international office for the collection, arrangement, and distribution of information relative to the protection of the rights of authors over their literary and artistic productions. It also provided that the information so obtained should be published in a periodical to be printed in the French language. With commendable promptness, the first number appeared on January 15, 1888, and regularly, on the 15th of each month since, there has been issued a thin number of this valuable journal. Typographically it presents an attractive appearance, with a page somewhat larger than that of the *Nation*, and also of three columns, but with larger type. The contents is divided into two parts, "official" and "unofficial." Into the first division falls anything directly relating to the International Union, the text of the treaty, and articles commenting on or explanatory of its provisions, together with the texts of the more recent copyright laws of various countries; while the unofficial portion contains a variety of articles of interest and value in relation to literary or artistic property. Notable copyright decisions rendered in European courts are printed at length, with comments, and there is a bibliographical section in which books on copyright are reviewed and articles in current journals noticed.

—Of contributions of more than usual importance published in the two volumes, may be mentioned an anonymous series on the retroactive clause in the international treaty; three papers analyzing the different articles of convention to determine the legal status of each, from the very competent hand of Prof. d'Orelli of Zurich, who was one of the framers of that document; and a third series of articles, also unsigned, on the registration of titles and the deposit of copies. In the two years which have slipped away since the formation of the Union, but two additional countries have been admitted into it, namely, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, May 23, 1888, and the diminutive principality of Monaco, May 30, 1889. Of more importance is the formation of a similar union among the States of South America. An international treaty for the protection of literary and artistic property, modelled after the Berne Convention, was signed on January 11, 1889, by the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, Chili, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay, an occurrence which the United States delegates to the Pan-American Congress might make a note of, in view of the fact that our Congress has placed copyright upon the list of subjects for discussion at the present Conference. The Director of the International Union is also the editor of the official journal, and the duties of this position have been acceptably performed by Mr. Henri Morel, formerly President of the Federal Assembly of Switzerland. We should be glad to see this excellent journal widely distributed in the United States, and doubt not that it would have good results in helping to bring about the much-desired international copyright law.

—A package of private papers belonging to Alexander Hamilton has been lately brought to light in a loft of the Treasury Building at Washington. The greater part of these are declarations, pleas, etc., filed in the Supreme Court of this State during the years 1785 and 1786. Some of these bear the endorsement of Aaron Burr, calling on Hamilton, as defendant's attorney, to plead in twenty days or permit judgment to be taken. Besides these and other legal papers, are a few letters addressed to Hamilton, requesting his professional services. The most interesting of them is one dated Charleston, S. C., February 27, 1786, from Mr. Charles Goodwin, who encloses a letter of attorney authorizing Hamilton to collect a debt due from Barent Roorbach, and a penal bond upon which the indebtedness arose. This bond, executed by Roorbach (who is styled "Captain of the First Battalion of Delancey's Regiment") on the 12th day of March, 1782, "and in the twenty-second year of his Majesty's Reign," required the payment of a certain sum of "good and lawful money of Great Britain" to Salina, Countess Dowager of Huntingdon, in the penalty of a certain larger sum. Charles Goodwin of "Charlestown," attorney-at-law, was joined as surety, and payment in full had been made by him. He writes to Hamilton: "I would wish you to make an Application to him by letter first & as the suretyship I entered into for him was for a Negro boy he bought here, if he will give him to me I will take him for the money I have paid [seventy pounds], provided you think him worth it." Mr. Goodwin further says, that although he has not the honor of being acquainted with Hamilton, "yet from your Character I am induced to trouble you," etc. After reading this declaration, Hamilton must have been somewhat chagrined to observe that at the lower left-hand corner of the letter he is addressed as "Wm. Hamilton, Esqr." The same error occurs in the letter of attorney, but the "William" has been cancelled and "Alexander" written above.

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1653.

The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1628-1660. Selected and edited by Samuel R. Gardiner. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1889.

MR. GARDINER has revealed to the mass of English readers the Constitution of 1653. The Instrument of Government which embodies the political ideas of Cromwellian Puritanism has long been accessible to any one who chooses to turn to the Parliamentary history; and has no doubt been read by more than one historical investigator. But Mr. Gardiner's 'Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution' will now, it may be hoped, make the Constitution of 1653 as well known to ordinary students as Magna Charta or the Bill of Rights. His excellent book has scores of claims to notice, but to constitutionalists its chief interest for the moment lies in its bringing into the light of public day the document which, above all others, embodies the ideas of government entertained by the most capable among the Puritan leaders.

To any one who studies the Constitution of 1653 in the light of a lawyer and a politician, the fact soon becomes apparent that the constitutionalism of the Commonwealth differed radically from the sort of government which the course of events and the influence of the Whigs finally established in England. The Instrument of Government is the work of men who, compared with the Whigs of 1689 and their successors, were both Revolutionists and, strange though the expression sounds, Conservatives. In some of its provisions the Cromwellian Constitution anticipates ideas which, as far as they have been realized at all, have found their realization rather in the United States than in the United Kingdom. Some of its provisions, on the other hand, are a revival of Elizabethan ideas. Here, as elsewhere, you are met by the paradox, which pervades the whole history of Puritanism, that the heroes of the Rebellion were at once innovators and conservatives. Their eyes were fixed: they were so much occupied with their hopes of the future and their dreams of the past, that they hardly suited their own time, and were forced ultimately to yield the guidance of England's destinies to men who could adjust their policy to the wants of the day.

Any reader of the Instrument of Government will do well to note its two different sides, and to understand how it is connected, on the one hand with the eighteenth or the nineteenth century, and on the other with the sixteenth. The very framework of the Instrument of Government connects it with modern times. It is the first of those written constitutions of which, since the foundation of the American commonwealth, Europe and America have produced so many. It is, again, an essentially democratic constitution; for its very first article refers indirectly to the "People" in a way utterly alien to monarchical ideas. The Constitution, again, is what Mr. Bryce has happily called "rigid." Mr. Gardiner, indeed, believes that the Instrument of Government was intended by its authors to be not only unchanged, but unchangeable. On this subject his opinion is of such weight as to be almost decisive; but a merely legal critic might be inclined to suspect that Mr. Gardiner has not fully appreciated a distinction which would certainly occur to the mind of any court which might be called upon to interpret the articles of the Constitution. A careful study of their terms suggests that while some "fundamentals," to use Cromwell's expression, embodied in articles 35 to 39, and having reference mainly to religious liberty, were meant to be legally immutable, the other articles of the Constitution could not, indeed, be amended in the way of ordinary legislation, by laws passed by Parliament without the consent of the Protector, but were capable of amendment by bills passed by Parliament and assented to by the Protector. However this may be—and we must again repeat that, to our minds, Mr. Gardiner's opinion is in itself of such weight that its correctness hardly admits of question—one thing is certain: the Constitution of 1653 is marked by a kind of rigidity foreign to the Constitution of England, but characteristic of both the Constitution of the United States and of polities modelled upon it. It is also noteworthy that the Constitution established by Cromwell contains, as regards religious liberty, just such an enunciation of general principles as might form part of those declarations of rights which have appeared in most of the democratic constitutions created during the last hundred years.

The nature and position, again, of the Parliament created by the Instrument is in con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formity with the democratic notions of to-day. It consists of a single house, which can, except as regards the amendment of the Constitution, pass laws of its own authority without the necessity for obtaining the assent of the Protector. He can remonstrate, he can slightly delay legislation, but he possesses nothing equivalent to a veto. The Protector himself might fairly be described as a President elected for life: he is not removable; he has large executive powers; he appoints every official of the Government; he is secured a revenue and an army. But he is compelled to act more or less in harmony with a permanent Council, consisting of from fifteen to twenty-one members, who themselves are irremovable, except for misconduct, and who, when a vacancy occurs, are nominated by the combined action of Parliament and the Protector. The Council, moreover, form the body which elects succeeding Protectors. It is hardly fanciful to find in the Council a certain vague likeness to the American Senate. It is assuredly not fanciful to trace in the Constitution of 1653 marked points of resemblance with the institutions of the United States.

Under the first Constitution of the Protectorate, the Constitution becomes, in England as it is in America, the supreme law of the land; all the authorities which it creates—Protector, Council, Parliament—derive their powers from its articles; the Council, as has been said, distantly resembles the Senate; the Parliament bears a striking resemblance to Congress; the whole polity is pervaded by the influence of the doctrine to which Montesquieu, a century later, gave world-wide currency under the name of the "separation of powers." If the Instrument of Government had continued in force, that blending of the executive and the legislature which is accomplished in modern England by the creation of a Parliamentary Cabinet, would have been impossible, and the Parliament of England would, like Congress, have remained a law-making body of limited powers, which could legislate but did not pretend to govern. The Protector is a President appointed for life. His powers are greater than those theoretically possessed, and still more than those practically exercised, by President Harrison, but they are of the same kind; for the Protector, like the President, was the real head of a real executive. It is not at all certain that, had a first-rate soldier occupied the position of President Lincoln, his powers would have fallen much short of the authority conferred upon Cromwell in 1653. It has been said with considerable truth that an American President is a copy of an English King in the time of George the Third; he was meant to exercise, during his tenure of office, all the powers which, in the opinion of Englishmen, could be rightly exercised by an English King. It is not untrue to say that the Protectorate was, so to speak, a copy of the English Kingship during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Protector was endowed for life with the prerogatives which the Puritan leaders believed rightly to belong to an English King, for it must always be remembered that the original aim of the Puritan movement was, not to curtail the constitutional prerogatives of the crown, but to prevent the encroachments of despotism, and to insure that the royal prerogatives were used for the benefit of the nation. In the earlier stages of the conflict with Charles, no one maintained that the King's legal prerogatives were too great, but that, under the advice of bad Ministers, he both exceeded his legal powers and used his prerogatives for the destruction of the nation. Here, however, we come across the conservative, we might almost say the reactionary, side of the Puritan Revolution.

To Puritans, the ideal of an English monarch was Elizabeth. To understand this, we must remember that the great Tudor Queen is known to us in some respects more truly than to the statesmen of the seventeenth century. Her vanity, her dishonesty, her parsimony, and her meanness have all been unfolded to us by the diligence of inquirers who, in their zeal for research, are too prone to delight in the discovery of small facts while neglecting to recognize large truths. To the Puritans, who had suffered under the incapacity, the selfishness, the narrowness, the treachery, and the stupidity of the Stuarts, and who knew that Charles at his best could not understand the spirit of Englishmen, Elizabeth naturally became a model ruler; she was the Queen who had defeated the Armada, and who had placed England at the head of the Protestant interest. She was the Queen who, with all her faults, could, at a crisis, give up her whims in deference to the demand of the nation, and who, like her father, while determined to be a strong ruler, felt that the support of Parliament added to the strength of the Crown. The aim of the men who framed the Instrument of Government, therefore, was to place at the head of the State a man who, under the articles of the Constitution, should exercise for life the prerogatives of Elizabeth, and exercise them in accordance with both the interest and the will of the nation.

The constitutionalists of 1653 had not the least idea of creating a ruler who should reign and not govern. The powers conferred upon the Protector are ample. He is provided with an army and with a fixed revenue; he possesses even a legal power of temporary legislation. He is surrounded, however, by a council which undoubtedly was meant to play much the part of the Privy Council at the time when the Privy Council formed, so to speak, the administration. But if the Protector is not intended to be the servant of Parliament, neither is he intended to dispense with the advice of Parliament. The Constitution establishes a "triennial" Parliament, *i. e.*, a Parliament which must meet once in every three years, and which, during the first five months of the session, cannot be prorogued against the will of Parliament. The Protector, in short, is intended to be exactly such a strong and wise monarch as was Elizabeth—at any rate in the imagination of the men who detested the Stuarts. The Protector governs, but he governs with the aid of a Council composed of experienced statesmen. The Protector rules the State, but he is compelled to hear the voice of Parliament. The Protector can make ordinances, but he cannot legislate. He is, in short, not a constitutional King in the modern sense of that term, but a true ruler, who, like the best English Kings, governs in harmony with the Houses of Parliament because he, no less than the Houses, represents the nation.

Nor are the main points in which the written Constitution of 1653 differs from the unwritten Constitution as it existed under Elizabeth so vital as they might at first sight appear. Let it be granted, in deference to Mr. Gardiner's opinion, that the Constitution was legally unchangeable; still, this element of immutability was in reality no novelty. It may well be doubted whether any lawyer or statesman of the sixteenth or seventeenth century would have admitted to the full the now acknowledged authority of Parliament (including in that term the Crown) to alter the foundations of the English polity. The maintainer of the dogma that the English Constitution recognizes no fundamental laws, would at any time prior to the Revolution of 1689 have placed himself in conflict not only with public opinion, but very possibly with the law of the land as interpreted by judges and jurymen. The real though limited toleration secured by the articles of the Constitution for "all who profess faith in God by Jesus Christ" marks, no doubt, a decided advance in ideas of religious freedom. But, after all, the Puritan constitutionalists of 1653 had not progressed much beyond the principles maintained by Elizabeth. They tolerated sects whom the Queen would have condemned, but, to make up, they excluded from their toleration Prelatists, whom she would have favored. Under the rule of the Protector, as under the rule of the Queen no religious liberty is extended to Catholics. We shall not, therefore, go far wrong if we hold that the framers of the Puritan Constitution meant to found a government which should realize the best traditions of the Tudor monarchy.

To modern English Liberals, imbued as they are with the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty, the position of statesmen who wish to establish at once a strong Legislature and also a strong and independent executive, appears chargeable with inconsistency. To Americans, who are accustomed to the action of non-sovereign legislative bodies, it easily becomes apparent that the political aspirations of the Puritans were in no sense self-contradictory. Any man, moreover, whether Englishman or American, who examines without prejudice the Constitution of the German Empire, will see clearly enough that modern Germans desire and have, in fact, obtained very much the kind of government which the men who framed the Constitution of 1653 wished to establish in England. The German Emperor could not, if he would, omit to summon the Diet. He could not legislate except by means of laws passed and approved by the Imperial Diet. But the Diet or Federal Parliament, while it is a real Legislature, is nothing like a sovereign power. It could not, if it wished, dismiss Bismarck from office, nor could it restore Bismarck to office if he were dismissed by the Emperor. In Germany, as in the England of Cromwell, Parliamentary government is not identified with government by Parliament. The more carefully, in short, the reader studies the Constitution of 1653, the more clearly he will become convinced that the Puritans aimed at establishing a form of Government radically different from the Constitutional Monarchy or Parliamentary Democracy which the course of events, rather than the foresight of statesmen, has produced or developed in England. The Instrument of Government resembles, from one point of view, the Constitution of the United States. It resembles, from another, the Constitution of England as it existed, or was supposed by the men of the seventeenth century to have existed, in the time of the Tudors. But it has little real similarity to the Constitutional Monarchy founded by the Whigs of 1689 and democratized by the Whigs and Radicals of the nineteenth century.

Remarks and Collections by Thomas Hearne. Edited by C. E. Doble, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1889.

HEARNE again! May not one wonder what there is in this Hearne that volume after volume of choosings from his hand-written books of jottings is given to the world, in good paper and print? Indeed, the great number of American reader-folk need not take any shame to themselves if they cannot recall the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man to mind. His editions of Leland's 'Itinerary' and 'Collectanea' (in which what he put there of his own was thought, by some, to be better than his much-praised author's) were for English people, and for a generation of them who, with their children and their children's children, are all ghosts. Moreover, Englishmen, in flesh and blood, are nowadays only a few of those who read our tongue; and furthermore, Hearne's Livy and his Younger Pliny and his Justin and Eutropius, which in their day were very good, have been pushed off to darkness and dust a good while since.

Yet, after all, it is not hard to see how this same Thomas Hearne, the assistant keeper of the Bodleian Library, nearly 200 years agone, may be of some account—even of much account—to a considerable class of English people, and to some among ourselves. He was an honest man, a scholar, and an antiquarian; he cherished in his heart "the good old cause," in an age, too, when it was easier than it is now to keep on believing that one family had a right indefeasible, from foolish father to bad son, to rule all others, in at least one country, while the earth shall hold together. He had a strong feeling, too, for "the non-jurors"—the men who chose to lose their places in the Church and in the State rather than take the oaths to what they counted an usurping dynasty.

England has a great many scholarly men, and a great many lovers of old things and searchers for them; and it has, also, a good many who are fain to lay hold of, and hold fast, some one or other broken (and *well*-broken) strand of history flying in the wind and wasting, as that of the turned-out Stuart family, for an example, and are sorry that they do not see the way to fasten it to the moving world, or make the moving world once fast to it. We, too, have men who are, by instinct, antiquarian, and we are not wanting, altogether, in those who profess a sacred liking for the Charles the First that Van Dyke painted, and the Young Chevalier of the songs; and who, in our freedom-nursing American air, maintain for Stuarts and others, selfish, narrow-minded, little-hearted, cruel people, a "right divine to govern wrong," if they wish to govern so, and find their chance.

Moreover, there are many churchmen in both countries who believe the "Erastian" rule of the State over the Church to be no whit more right, and to be to the full as bad, as "sacerdotal" rule of the Church over the State; and that, under the Dutch William and the German Georges, the religiousness of the English people was dulled, and beaten down, and deadened, and that its ways were made coarse and low. To these it seems that, in those times, the worse and wrong had the upper hand in both Church and State, and that the honest, true men—bishops, priests, and laymen—who, having everything snatched from them that greedy and unfeeling hands could tear away, met their fate meekly, and went into it and under it because they ought, have good claim to be righted by true, honest men of after times. So that able scholar, known to every classic man, Prof. John E. B. Mayor, writes: "Perhaps . . . the time has come when one may venture, without offence or loss of intellectual caste, to challenge the vulgar verdict upon the non-jurors, and may at least call upon their censors to name any English sect as eminent, in proportion to its numbers, alike for solid learning and for public as well as private virtues."

Now, at Oxford, about six generations of breathing men behind us, in the "Bodlejan" Library (as he, like a scholar, wrote the name), and while the "rightfu', lawfu' king" was out, and the faithful were non-jurors and at the bottom, was day after day, and year by year, our Thomas Hearne; in the very eye of one of the great political and religious centres of England; misliking things as they were, and those who handled them; hearing, seeing, and writing down. Often he was vexed in his soul; sometimes he took in a mouthful of sweet comfort. So, looking at the days in which he lived, and at the people that he lived among, and at the sort of man that he was, and at what he was about, in his by-times, with his pen and pocket-book, we do not wonder that Englishmen can be found—and a few Americans—to welcome him in print. The rest of us, too, who believe that the gaining of freedom to think and to do is the gaining of something which is worth all price, even though, at first, it should be coupled with unworthy conditions (for these are to be righted in time), can feel for others if they stood by what they saw to be a truth, though, as we look at it, it was a sham.

Our man, we think, was rather picturesque, perhaps. We can make him so to ourselves, as his likeness slowly settles in our minds; and we incline to use some phrase like Klearchus's "ὥφελε μὲν Κῦρος ζῆν!" though not to the spoiling of those still-living words. We may say that we should like an etching of this steadfast, trusty, possibly a little crabbed, "Jacobite" and (half?) "non-juror." There are many chances to one that he was not handsome, or "distinguished"-looking, or well dressed; he may have been ungainly, even rawboned and coarse-skinned; but, being a shrewd man, with eyes quick to watch those about him, and the comers and goers, in times when it was "touch-and-go" with any man of any account, we should like a glimpse of him, caught in a twinkling. His wig might be a little awry; a grim smile might float about his tightened lips as he wrote, glibly, how "that old smooth-booted, self-interested, ambitious, paultry Lancaster" (the Vice-Chancellor of the University—and a Whig, of course) had met a rebuff, or mortification; or his brows might have been knitted, and his teeth set, while he put down, in black and white, what "that sneaking, snivelling" wretch, and his likes, were plotting.

Besides what he saw and heard of living men, and of things at his hand, there are here some curious passages gathered in his scholarly researches among books: altogether, a pouch from which we may take some good things—though not this time.

Five Thousand Miles in a Sledge: A Midwinter Journey across Siberia. By Lionel F. Gowing. D. Appleton & Co. 1890. 8vo, pp. xx, 257. Illustrated.

THIS is a story of a journey from Shanghai by two young Englishmen, who went by the usual route to Vladivostok, and thence sledged it across Siberia. The story is told in a brisk and pleasant fashion, and will entertain many readers. Nothing extraordinary occurred. For Americans the most interesting paragraphs are those in which the author expresses his opinion on the diverse views upheld in regard to the exile system (p. xi.), one of which we quote:

"But the opinion strongly impressed upon the mind of the present writer—an opinion which was completely shared by his companion of the voyage—is, that although Dr. Lansdell has dispelled some erroneous ideas and disproved some false stories in regard to Russia's treatment of her prisoners, political and social, he has been misled into presenting a picture of Siberian prison management which is far too roseate-hued, and which does infinitely more credit to the Russian Government than is deserved. Having first heard, when in the heart of Siberia, of the great and noble work in which Mr. George Kennan had then been so recently engaged, the author cannot omit the opportunity of bearing testimony to the high opinion entertained there as to the unsparing pains which Mr. Kennan had taken to arrive at the truth, and as to the value his work was likely to have in placing before American and English readers a reliable account of the sufferings of Siberian prisoners."

Coming from a personal friend of Dr. Lansdell, and one to whom Mr. Kennan was personally unknown, the above-cited testimony is highly gratifying to all interested in the reform of barbarous penal systems and in the brave and gifted traveller referred to.

Literature and Poetry. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890.

THE main part of Dr. Schaff's bulky volume is occupied with a history of the great Church Hymns, the Dies Iræ, Stabat Mater, and hymns of St. Bernard, with many translations in English and German which it is interesting to compare with one another, though none of them are successful in rendering the sonorous and direct Latin with real adequacy. A Scriptural interest also governs the remainder of the essays, one of which is devoted to a learned and instructive account of the poetry of the Bible, its forms, characteristics, power, etc. This on the whole is the most valuable of the entire contents. Other essays are upon the English language and the types of universities old and new, and upon Dante. In none of these is there anything specially noteworthy in knowledge or treatment. They are, in fact, elementary studies in their various spheres; but the seriousness which pervades them, and the nearness at all times of a religious spirit, give them a certain distinction which makes an impression on the mind. Literary culture throughout is overborne and not infrequently displaced by the mind of the theologian, to a degree which removes the work as a whole from the department of miscellaneous criticism of literary subjects to that of religion. The spirit is more than earnest, the matter is laboriously set forth, and seriousness takes the place of taste as the arbiter of judgment. This, however, does not materially affect the value of the volume, especially in that portion of it which is devoted to the Church hymns and the Biblical poems; of which we shall hardly find a better account elsewhere.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Abbot, Prof. F. E. The Way Out of Agnosticism. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. $1.
Anderson, J. English Intercourse with Siam in the 17th Century. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
Appleton, G. W. Frozen Hearts: A Romance. D. Appleton & Co. 75 cents.
Ball, Sir R. S. Star-Land: Talks with Young People about the Wonders of the Heavens. Cassell & Co. $2.
Barkan, Dr. L. How to Preserve Health. Exchange Printing Co.
Barton, G. B. History of New South Wales. Vol. I. Governor Phillip, 1783-89. London: Trübner & Co.
Bell, M. Roanoke of Roanoke Hall. Belford Co.
Brinton, Dr. D. G. Essays of an Americanist. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.
Clark, Col. E. History of the Seventh Regiment of New York, 1806-1889. Vol. I. New York: Published by the Seventh Regiment.
Clark, Kate E. The Dominant Seventh: A Musical Story. D. Appleton & Co.
Dryden, J. Essay of Dramatic Poesy. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 90 cents.
Fyffe, C. A. A History of Modern Europe. Vol. III. 1848-1878. Henry Holt & Co. $2.50.
Gerard, Dorothea. Lady Baby: A Novel. Harper & Bros. 45 cents.
Gray, E. C. Idle Musings: Essays in Social Mosaic. London: William Heinemann.
Greer, Rev. D. H. The Historical Christ, the Moral Power of History. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.
Hall, H. Court Life under the Plantagenets. (Reign of Henry II.) Macmillan & Co. $4.
Harrison, L. R. Rothermal: A Story of Lost Identity. Am. News Co. 50 cents.
Hearn, L. Two Years in the French West Indies. Harper & Bros.
Henry, Prof. V. Short Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. Macmillan & Co. $1.90.
Hoffmann, Prof. Tricks with Cards. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.
Xenophon. Works, translated by H. G. Dakyns. Vol. I. Hellenica and Anabasis. Macmillan & Co. $2.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED